DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 852 CG 024 894

AUTHOR Stern, Leonard W.
TITLE Funding Patterns of Nonprofit Organizations That Provide Youth Development Services: An Exploratory Study.
PUB DATE Feb 92
NOTE 151p.; A report prepared for the Task Force on Youth Development and Community Programs of the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescent Development; *Child Development; *Financial Support; *Human Services; *Nonprofit Organizations; *Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

This study examined the sources of funds for nonprofit agencies which provide youth development services. It tapped multiple sources, including reports compiled about their affiliates' revenue by the national headquarters of youth-serving agencies; studies of seven communities conducted by The Johns Hopkins University Institute for Policy Studies and the Social Policy Research Group, Inc.; the United Way of America; the Foundation Center; various documents containing information about federal funding; and interviews with organization officials and experts. Results indicated that affiliates of the largest national youth-serving organizations received a larger share of their support from United Way than did smaller independent agencies, and also received the lion's share of foundation dollars directed at adolescents. Corporate support did not appear to be a significant source of revenue. Smaller independent agencies were considerably more dependent on government funds than were large national youth development organizations. Larger, established agencies and those affiliated with recognizable national organizations appeared more able to maintain financial stability and to grow than were smaller independent agencies. Unrestricted support was increasingly difficult to obtain, and funders were reluctant to pay for indirect or administrative overhead costs. Agencies appeared to be diversifying their income sources. Service populations of some national organizations identified as youth-serving were increasing the numbers of younger children they served. Finally, significant differences were found in the extent to which affiliates of national youth-serving organizations served adolescents in at-risk circumstances. (NB)

FUNDING PATTERNS OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS THAT PROVIDE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SERVICES:

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

A REPORT PREPARED FOR THE TASK FORCE ON YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS OF THE CARNEGIE COUNCIL ON ADOLESCENT DEVELOPMENT

Leonard W. Stern
February . 92

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development for providing him with the opportunity to investigate and learn about this significant issue, and especially to the Project's director, Jane Quinn, for her counsel and direction.

He expresses thanks to:

- Gretchen Van Fossan, who provided research assistance
- the officials of public and private organizations -- too numerous to name -- who were so helpful, so cooperative, so responsive to his requests for information and opinions
- those individuals who conducted extensive, special searches and analyses which were so informative -- Janna Myllyluoma of The Johns Hopkins University Institute for Policy Studies, Linda Deane of United Way of America, and Phyllis Andrews of The Foundation Center
- Marguerite Rhodes, who transformed frequently mumbled dictation and illegible handwriting into a paper which, at least, can be read.

Summary

This report examines the sources of funds for not-for-profit agencies which provide youth development services, focusing particularly on young adolescents in at-risk environments. It does not cover the universe of such agencies. While some information is included on "grass-roots" unaffiliated agencies, primary attention is on local affiliates of selected national youth-serving organizations. The finances of the national headquarters of these organizations are not examined herein. Both the national headquarters and the "grass-roots" organizations are subjects of other parts of the Task Force's work.

This inquiry attempted to learn about the sources of agency revenue, the extent to which funds are utilized to provide youth development services to young adolescents in at-risk circumstances, changes in funding patterns over time, and variations in such patterns in different types of agencies.

A feasibility study conducted earlier pointed up numerous limitations on the availability of data. Since there is no single repository for the information needed for this exploration, multiple sources were tapped, including:

- reports compiled about their affiliates' revenue by the national headquarters of youth-serving agencies
- studies of seven communities conducted by The Johns Hopkins University Institute for Policy Studies and the Social Policy Research Group, Inc.
- The United Way of America
- The Foundation Center
- Various documents containing information about federal funding
- Interviews with organization officials and experts

Little or no information is included about support from corporations, local and state governments, or alternative federated funds. Difficulties in obtaining comparable and reliable data are described in the report.

Analysis of the data indicates that:

- Affiliates of the largest national youth-serving organizations receive a larger share of their support from United Ways than smaller independent agencies, but the share of their budgets coming from United Ways is decreasing. The portion of all United Way

funds allocated to the service of adolescents has remained constant over the past five years.

- The national youth-serving organizations receive the lion's share of foundation dollars directed at adolescents. While the percentage of dollars and grants awarded by foundations for preventive youth services has doubled since 1984, the share of dollars and grants for youth in 1990 was still a small percentage of foundation awards for all purposes. Foundation grants for youth tend to be smaller than the average size of grants for all purposes.

- Corporate support does not appear to be a significant or growing source of agency revenue

- Smaller independent agencies are considerably more dependent on government funds than the large national youth development organizations.

- Larger, established agencies and those affiliated with recognizable national organizations appear more able to maintain financial stability and to grow than smaller independent agencies

- Unrestricted support is increasingly difficult to obtain, and funders are reluctant to pay for indirect or administrative overhead costs

- In an increasingly competitive funding marketplace, agencies are diversifying their income sources

- The service populations of some of the national organizations identified as "youth-serving" include relatively small percentages of adolescents; these organizations are increasing the numbers of younger children they serve

- There are significant differences in the extent to which affiliates of national youth-serving organizations serve adolescents in at-risk circumstances. Service to this population is considerably greater in organizations affiliated with Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America, Boys and Girls Clubs of America, Girls Incorporated, Child Welfare League of America, National Network of Runaway and Youth Services and ethnically-identified nationals such as ASPIRA and the National Urban League than in scouting and Camp Fire groups.

The report also discusses, but reaches no conclusion on such matters as:

- the difficulty relating the size of agency budgets to the number of youth served

- the extent to which access to services by low-income youth may be reduced when agencies raise dues or fees for service

- influences on priorities established by funders

- the degree to which agency services may be modified to accommodate funders' interests

Concern is expressed about the energy and resources which agencies must invest in financial development in order to remain viable -- a complex process particularly burdensome and threatening for smaller agencies. Various proposals are reviewed which might help to develop a larger pool of targeted funds, provided in less fragmentary fashion, and more equitably accessible to smaller organizations.

The Task Force is asked to consider such actions as:

- support for a youth development block grant

- support for funding of the Young Americans Act

- further examination of proposals for specially designated taxes for youth development

- the development of standards and guidelines for funders and service-providers which would encourage increased service to adolescents in at-risk environments

- encouragement of community foundations to provide assistance to small agencies designed to improve their ability to compete for funds

- support for a national nongovernmental center for youth development

Finally, topics for further study are suggested in areas including the development of improved data on the sources and uses of funds; the role of state and local governments in supporting youth services; the role and effectiveness of "umbrella" organizations; the relationship between the budgets of national organizations and their local affiliates; the reasons for variations in funding patterns of different national organizations; factors which influence the priorities established by funders;

costs associated with services to adolescents compared to services for other age groups; cooperative approaches to cost reduction; and additional innovative approaches to financing youth services, such as the semi-postal stamp.

FUNDING PATTERNS OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS THAT PROVIDE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SERVICES: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

When the Task Force on Youth Development and Community Programs of the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development commissioned this paper, several reasons were cited for its interest in learning about the funding patterns of America's youth-serving organizations. Among them were the following:

- Since the Project on Youth Development and Community Programs is about reform of a sector of institutions which is largely dependent on government and philanthropic support for its survival and growth, information about funding patterns could help develop a strategy to leverage change in a positive direction.
- Among the questions of interest to the Task Force is "Who is responsible for promoting positive youth development through community programs?" Are actual or potential funding sources paying their "fair share"? Information about sources may assist the Task Force as it seeks to recommend ways to expand the scope and availability of developmentally appropriate, community based programs and services for young adolescents.

- The Project is particularly interested in expanding services to young adolescents who are growing up in high-risk environments. The Project wishes to supplement community-based research with a macro-level analysis which attempts to determine the extent to which financial support tends to go to organizations which typically serve more or less advantaged youth.
- The Task Force is interested in understanding obstacles to serving youth in at-risk situations, particularly low income youth. For example, is there a greater reliance now than in the past on fees for service and other earned income strategies, and does this have an impact on agencies' willingness or ability to serve low income youth?

Initially, it was hoped that funding patterns could be examined over a twenty-year period. But there was some skepticism (which proved well-founded) about the availability of data which would be responsive to the Project's concern and which could establish trends over this period of time. It was agreed that the first step would be to conduct a feasibility study to determine the availability of useful data.

The feasibility study, which was completed in December 1990, attempted to discover whether data existed with the following characteristics:

- The funds went to nonprofit organizations.

- The funds were directed to youth development activities or activities which deal with "prevention" rather than programs dealing with treatment or control of particular problems.
- The funds were intended primarily to serve ten- to fifteen-year-old adolescents.
- The funds targeted young adolescents living in at-risk circumstances and were directed at low-income communities.
- The data extended back over a twenty-year period, preferably, so changes and patterns could be tracked.

Three major classes of informants were contacted: major national funders -- government, United Way, and foundations; individuals and organizations which have studied nonprofits; and national organizations which deliver services to young people. More than thirty individuals from nearly a like number of organizations were interviewed in person or by phone, and data from their organizations were reviewed. The feasibility study concluded what <u>cannot</u> be obtained on a comprehensive and reliable basis from existing national sources are funding data which:

- Are specific to ten- to fifteen-year-olds. Categories are generally much broader and are not helpful in differentiating between programs for twelve-year olds and programs for nineteen- or twenty-year olds.
- Cover a twenty-year period.

- Relate dollar sources and purposes to specific programs.
- Identify funds on the basis of at-risk circumstances, particularly young adolescents living in poorer communities.
- Deal distinctly with funding for youth development or prevention, as contrasted with that which targets specific problems faced by this age group.
- Cover a wide range of independent and grass roots agencies as well as local agencies affiliated with national organizations.
- Track the federal dollars which went through states to nonprofit organizations which serve young adolescents.

This study concluded further that what probably can be obtained is:

- Information about foundation and United Way funds over a period of up to ten years, by extrapolating from existing reports of the United Way of America and the Foundation Center.
- Information on current and recent expenditures of selected federal agencies.
- Further information about shifts over time in the amounts, sources and purposes of available funds as well as insights into the ramifications of funding patterns, by analyzing data available from recipient

agencies and existing national studies, and by interviewing agency and organization officials.

On the basis of the feasibility study, Carnegie Council staff decided to proceed with this paper, with the understanding that:

- It would not be possible to gather data over a twenty-year period, and that we would aim for a ten-year span.
- Practically no one keeps records specifically on the ten- to fifteen-year-old group in which the project is interested. Conclusions would have to be drawn from data on a broader adolescent age group collected in a nonstandard manner by different organizations.
- "At-risk" is not a category of adolescents on which data are maintained. Nevertheless it was determined that we would try at least to get as much information as possible about income level, race and ethnicity, as indicators of "at-risk" circumstances.
- We would not include "in-kind" support such as volunteer time, focusing only on financial support. Yet it should be noted that volunteers provide considerable support for many agencies. Boy Scouts of America, for example, uses one million volunteers; the National 4-H Center estimates the value of volunteer services in 4-H programs at $1 billion.
- While the focus of this analysis is on local agencies which provide direct services to young people (and

not the funding of headquarters operations of national organizations which are being examined in another part of the overall Project), it would not be possible to obtain information directly from the thousands of existing local direct service organizations. The Project is gathering information about unaffiliated grassroots service organizations in a separate study; our focus was on local affiliates of national youth-serving organizations and information about them was gathered from their national headquarters. Additional information from the perspective of recipient agencies was obtained from other community based studies by independent research organizations, and that information includes unaffiliated youth service agencies as well as those connected to national organizations.

- We do not purport to cover all youth development activities. It is acknowledged that a significant amount of such work takes place under other community-based auspices, such as park and recreation districts, public and private schools, etc., which are not the subject of this exploration. The full report of the Task Force, however, does consider youth development efforts of such organizations.

B. Sources

Simply put, sources fall into two categories -- sources of information about organizations which receive funds, and sources of information about organizations which provide funds. Within these categories our major resources were as follows:

In re Organizations which Receive Funds

1. National youth-serving organizations.

2. Studies of seven communities -- Atlanta, Chicago, Minneapolis/St. Paul, Phoenix, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco (conducted by The Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies), and Boston (conducted by the Social Policy Research Group, Inc.).

In re Organizations which Provide Funds

1. United Way of America.

2. The Foundation Center.

3. Various sources which could provide information about federal funds: interviews and data gathered from selected federal agencies, and reports including "The Role of Federal Agencies in Adolescent Health" by the Office of Technology Assessment; "Adolescents at Risk" by Joy G. Dryfoos; "To Whom Do They Belong? Runaway, Homeless and Other Youth in High Risk Situations in the 1990s" by the National Network of Runaway and Youth Services; "Current Federal Policies and Programs for Youth" by Janet Reingold; and "Federal Programs Affecting Children and Their Families 1990" by the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families of the House of Representatives.

Efforts to obtain national information about corporate support for nonprofit organizations' services to adolescents

were unsuccessful and we do not know the extent of support from alternative funds, such as Women's Funds or Black United Funds. We suspect that, for the most part, affiliates of large national youth serving agencies are not recipients of such alternative funds, although "grass roots" organizations may be.

National information about local and state government support has been hard to come by; contacts with the National Governors Association, the National League of Cities, the National Conference of Mayors and the National Association of Counties uncovered no repository of useful data. Since local and state government support for youth-serving organizations, largely through contract arrangements, could be significant, the absence of information about the level of support from these sources is a serious gap.

The next section reports separately on information garnered from each of these sources.

II. THE DATA

A. Organizations Which Receive Funds

1. National Organizations

Prior to embarking on this particular study, the project director and members of the Task Force had conducted interviews with leaders of twenty national youth-serving organizations. While those interviews focused on the activities of the national headquarters, some relevant information about local affiliates was gathered and is referenced below.

We followed up those interviews with a letter to seventeen of these organizations suggested by Carnegie Council staff. Our letters described the project and the focus of this particular study. We indicated that we were interested in information about the funding of their affiliates and that we had a special interest in youth development or preventive activities for young adolescents (ten- to fifteen-year olds), especially those living in high-risk environments. We acknowledged that their data collection methods might not correspond to the categories of our interest, indicating that we would welcome whatever data they had reported in whatever way they collected them, and that we were interested in their impressions as well as quantifiable data. We asked each organization the following questions:

1. Can you provide information about where your local affiliates get their funds? What is their combined revenue on an annual basis? What portion (dollar amounts, percentages) of their revenue comes from:

- United Way.
- Federal, state, or local government grants or contracts.
- Foundations - national, community, corporate, other.
- Corporations.
- Fees for service.
- Membership dues.
- Individual donations.
- Other.

2. Can you estimate what portion of these funds went to serve young adolescents, or any broader category of adolescents?

3. Can you determine what portion of these funds went into youth development or preventive activities, as contrasted with interventions aimed at treating or controlling particular problems?

4. Can you connect major funding sources with the age group or activities specified in 2. and 3. above?

5. Do you have information on the characteristics of the youth you serve, particularly those which may indicate at-risk circumstances, such as low income status?

6. Do you find that funds are more easily available for particular program/problem areas, such as substance abuse prevention, teen-age pregnancy prevention, etc. than for core support of youth development activities?

7. Can you trace shifts in the sources and/or purposes of the funds received by your local affiliates over time? Can

you compare current funding patterns with those of five years ago? Ten years ago?

8. What do you believe motivates funders to adopt new interests and emphases?

9. Do you perceive that changes in the sources of funds or the interests of funders have, in fact, influenced changes in the target populations or program priorities of your local affiliates?

10. What are the major problems faced by your affiliates with regard to securing the funds they need to fulfill their missions?

11. What promising new approaches to raising funds for your affiliates have been developed?

These inquiries were addressed to the following national organizations.

American Red Cross

ASPIRA Assocation, Inc.

Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America

Boy Scouts of America

Boys and Girls Clubs of America

Camp Fire, Inc.

Child Welfare League of America

4-H

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.

Girls Incorporated.

Junior Achievement

National Network of Runaway and Youth Services

National Urban League

Salvation Army

WAVE (Work, Achievement, Values and Education)

YMCA of the U.S.A.

YWCA of the U.S.A.

The following is a report on each responding national organization whose information appeared to be useful for the purposes of this study. Reporting periods and categories vary from organization to organization. The fact that several of the organizations listed above are not reported upon below means only that they were not able to provide data relevant to this study; sometimes they are organizations that serve multiple groups with multiple programs and do not separate services to adolescents. All of the organizations listed above provide significant and valuable services to adolescents, whether or not reports on them are included below.

The tables and comments which follow summarize information gathered from written reports received from the organizations and from telephone and in-person interviews. Tables 1 through 11 contain data about income for local affiliates only (clubs, councils, agencies); national headquarters income is not included.

TABLE #1

ASPIRA Association
FY 1988

Number of Affiliates: 6

* Total Revenue: $ 5,203,601

Sources	Dollars	%
Foundations	706,428	13.6
Corporations	595,292	11.4
Government	3,548,356	68.2
United Way	269,909	5.2
Events	83,616	1.6

* This amount is supplemented by approximately $450,000 in pass-through funds from the National Headquarters of ASPIRA

Service Population: Approximately 13,000 Puerto Rican and other Latino youth (ages 11-18) and 1,000 parents

ASPIRA Association

Comments

ASPIRA is the smallest national youth development agency agency included here.

The last year for which financial data were available was FY 1987-88.

ASPIRA follows the pattern of other smaller, community-based organizations which serve poorer, minority populations:

- Its affiliates are heavily dependent on government
- Its affiliates receive only a small percentage of their support from United Way

It is also interesting to note that ASPIRA lists no affiliate income from dues and fees, and that, after government, foundations and corporations provide the largest share (25%) of its support.

TABLE #2

Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America

	1990	1986
Number of Agencies:	401 (83% of Total)	186 (60% of Total)
Total Income:	$64,599,961	

Sources	%	%
United Way	38.3	42
Government	9.0	
Foundations	3.4	5
Corporations	2.5	4
(1) Natl Fund Raising	21.8	18
Other special events	14.8	9
Individual contributions	4.8	5
(2) Dial America	0.7	3
Interest/Dividends	1.4	2
Other	3.3	

Demographics

		1990	1986
Number served		73,565	
Ages	5-7 yrs	7.0	14.2
	8-10 yrs	29.3	33.1
	11-13 yrs	37.8	31.2
	14-16 yrs	20.8	17.7
	17 yrs +	5.3	3.7
Income		43.5% receive income assistance	36% below poverty
Family	One parent	84.5	92.9
	Two parents	7.2	3.8
	(3) Other	8.2	3.4
Sex		M - 57.4%; F - 42.6%	M - 52%; F - 48%
Race/Ethnicity			
	White	67.3	68
	Black	21.8	23
	Hispanic	6.5	6
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1.0	-
	Native American	0.8	-
	Other	2.6	3

Notes: (1) Bowl-for-kids (2) Phone sale of magazines (3) Other relatives, group home, foster home

Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America

Comments

The small percentage of agencies reporting and less sophisticated procedures used in 1986 make comparisons with 1990 questionable. For example, the 1990 figure of 73,565 children and youth served includes over 17,000 who had gone through intake but were not yet "matched" with Big Brothers or Big Sisters. 1986 data included only 32,520 "matches", but do not include unmatched clients or reflect on the smaller percentage of agencies reporting. Total income from 1986 is not available. Thus, percentages only for 1986 are included in Table #2.

BB/BSA affiliates receive a higher percentage of their income from United Way than any other national organization - 38.3%. Yet the share of their income received from United Way appears to be down, as is the case elsewhere.

Since BB/BSA affiliates have no dues structure, they are totally dependent on earned income, grants, contributions and fund-raisers. The major increase is in the share of income from fund-raising and other special events; income from local special events and from the Bowl-for-Kids fund-raiser -- a national effort -- rose significantly.

BB/BSA's services are directed in large part at the population which is the Task Force's focus. Nearly two-thirds of the Little Brothers & Sisters are between the ages of 10 and 15; 93% do not live with both parents; 32% are minority; 43.5% receive income assistance.

TABLE #3

Boy Scouts of America

Income

	1990		1985	
Total income	$339,423,675		$252,292,951	
Sources	**Dollars**	**%**	**Dollars**	**%**
United Way	86,652,231	25.0	78,267,518	31.0
(1) Contributions	104,149,030	30.7	73,953,143	29.3
(2) Program Fees	84,421,057	24.9	63,463,033	25.1
(3) Other	64,201,357	18.9	36,636,257	14.5

Demographics

	1990		1985	
Total served	4,292,992		3,755,008	
Ages				
6-7 yrs	345,790 (Tiger Scouts)	8.1%	169,051	4.5%
8-10 yrs	1,831,778 (Cub Scouts)	42.7%	1,499,259	39.7%
11-13 yrs	958,740 (Boy Scouts)	22.3%	1,014,456	27.0%
14-17 yrs	59,758 (Varsity)	1.1%	48,430	1.3%
14-15 yrs	355,821 (Explorers)	8.3%	392,490	10.5%
(4) 14-15 yrs	741,105 (Career Awareness)	17.3%	631,322	16.8%

(5) Race/Ethnicity 18% minority

Notes:
(1) Individuals, corporations, foundations, special events, product sales
(2) Camping, rentals, etc.
(3) Earnings from endowments; sale of badges, uniforms; timber sales; oil well leases, etc.
(4) In 1990, 68% of Explorers were in the in-school Career Awareness component of the Explorers program; in 1985, 62% were in this component. 40% of the two Explorer programs are girls. All other programs are male only.
(5) BSA does not gather this information regularly. Data from a special membership survey.

Boy Scouts of America

Comments

While BSA membership has risen over the years, its composition has changed -- with increases in the numbers of younger children and those enrolled in in-classroom career awareness programs offsetting decreases in enrollment in the regular (Boy Scout and Explorer) programs for 11 to 15 year-olds. One-half of those served by BSA are 10 years old or younger, up from 44.2% in 1985. Between 1985 and 1990, the actual numbers in the Boy Scout and Explorer program (excluding the in-school Career Awareness program) declined by over 90,000. During the same period, Cub Scouts (8-10 years) increased by 330,000 and Tiger Scouts (6-7 years) more than doubled, increasing by 177,000.

The in-classroom (Career Awareness) component of the Explorer program and the special Varsity program of sports, merit badges and high adventure for 14 to 17 year-old young men rose by an additional 120,000. If the in-school program is not counted, 39% of BSA members are 11 years of age and over, down from 47% five years ago.

BSA does not collect data regularly on the socio-economic status or the race/ethnicity of those it serves. Of the 18% minority estimate gathered from a recent poll conducted together with Stanford Research Institute, officials believe that larger numbers of minorities will be found among the 800,000 youth who participate in their special Varsity and Career Awareness programs, leaving, of course, a smaller percentage of minorities in their regular programs.

BSA's records extend back well beyond 1985, but changes in accounting procedures make most comparisons with earlier years unproductive. Some significant differences can be observed between 1985 and 1990. BSA continues to consider United Ways as a significant source of income for their councils, and indeed in the last five years this source rose by $8.5 million (up by $20 million in 11 years). But as a percentage of total income during the same five years, the United Way share dropped 6% to one-quarter of total income; in 1980 United Ways accounted for 38.2% of all income.

Table 3 includes no dues income line, since national registration fees and dues for individual adult volunteers and youth ($7 per youth) all go to national headquarters.

Dollar-wise, every other income line rose by well over $20 million, but as a share of total income, the line designated as "other" showed the most significant increase. This line incorporates income from earnings, investments and sales, including unusual sources such as oil well leases, timber sales, etc. This is not unlike other organizations which hold considerable outdoor property such as camps and occasionally find saleable natural resources on the land. Since such income, however, is limited to certain Councils, it may skew the figures, increasing the disparity between the Councils with and without these special resources.

We do not have information on income vs. expenses at the Council level; thus, we cannot determine whether Councils have

accumulated surpluses similar to that of the national headquarters, which shows an operating surplus of over $11 million for each of the past two years.

Scouting officials believe there may be considerable regional differences in fund-raising capacity, with economically depressed areas of the country, such as the Northeast, having greater problems than others.

It should be noted that BSA does not show a line for income from government, since this source is negligible. Similarly, it is not possible to identify the level of corporate or foundation support, but organization officials do not consider these as major current sources, citing Giving U.S.A. statistics which show each of these sources as accounting for 5-6% of total giving.

Direct mail solicitation has not been a major source of income, but headquarters personnel believe that it may be a route which increasingly is being used by local units.

Scouting officials believe, as do officials of other nationals, that more organizations are competing in the private funding marketplace, and that some of these organizations may have been pushed into this marketplace by the decreased availability of government funds. They are not overly concerned about the potential impact of increased donor choice in federated fund-raising, believing that the name recognition of Boy Scouts will help them sustain their share.

TABLE #4

Boys and Girls Clubs of America

	1989		1985	
Total Income	$ 225,277,320		$ 180,355,177	
Sources	**Dollars**	**%**	**Dollars**	**%**
United Way	76,752,420	34.07	68,611,889	38.04
Contributions (Individuals, Corps. & Fdns.)	71,832,120	31.88	61,310,953	33.99
Dues & Fees	22,057,215	9.79	7,618,487	4.23
Government	18,532,065	8.23	9,597,666	5.32
Other	36,103,500	16.03	33,216,187	18.42

	1980		1971	
Total Income	$ 102,660,600		$ 41,941,244	
Sources	**Dollars**	**%**	**Dollars**	**%**
United Way	42,470,462	41.37	20,513,922	48.91
Contributions	30,583,150	29.79	10,468,137	24.96
Dues & Fees	4,432,289	4.32	2,271,015	5.41
Government	10,630,137	10.35	(information not requested)	
Other	14,544,562	14.17	8,688,170	20.72

Demographics

	1989	1985
Total served:	1.62 million	(not provided)

Ages

6 - 9 yrs.	37%
10 - 15 yrs.	53%
16 + over	10%

Ethnic/Racial 51% minority

Family Status 47% single family

Income 81% family income under $20,000

Geography 71% urban/inner city

Boys and Girls Clubs of America

Comments

Among national youth-serving organizations, Boys & Girls Clubs serves one of the largest populations of inner-city low-income youth. The bulk of its service population could be described as living in at-risk circumstances. Furthermore, the figures indicate that the majority of the youth BGCA serves falls in the age group which the Project has targeted.

Boys & Girls Clubs of America (formerly Boys Clubs of America) has shown dramatic growth over two decades, with its club income more than doubling in the 1970's and again in the 1980s.

Accompanying this growth is a significant shift in sources of income. United Way accounted for nearly half of the Clubs' support in 1971 and just over one-third in 1989. Contributions and government sources rose from $41 million in 1980 to $90 million in 1989, accounting for 40% of income at the beginning and end of the decade. While income from dues and fees was a relatively constant portion of income for 15 years (ranging from 5.4% to 4.3% from 1971 to 1985), this source rose dramatically in the past five years -- tripling in dollar amounts and accounting now for 9.8% of income. The bulk of this increase lies in sliding-scale fees for services such as summer camp and day care, rather than in dues.

BGCA officials have found government grants and grants from large foundations and civic groups to be more fruitful sources than ongoing, smaller contributions. They attribute

success in fundraising efforts to marketing -- relating the benefits of Club programs to contributors' interests, but Clubs' marketing skills still need improvement. High-priced ticket special events and packaging major programs for "underwriting" are promising approaches being developed by affiliates.

TABLE #5

Camp Fire Boys and Girls

	1990		1987		1983	
Total Income	40,486,711		36,387,400		30,240,632	
Sources	Dollars	%	Dollars	%	Dollars	%
Product Sales (Net)	7,063,810	17.5	6,451,700	17.7	6,087,392	20.1
United Way	13,604,055	33.6	13,649,700	37.5	11,789,204	38.9
Contributions, Legacies & Bequests	3,900,668	9.6	3,095,500	8.5	1,903,651	6.3
Grants & Contracts	2,364,854	5.8	1,265,100	3.5	157,491	0.5
Dues & Fees	10,283,503	25.4	8,016,400	22.0	[10,302,894	34.1
Other	3,269,820	9.2	3,918,000	10.8		

Demographics

	1989	1978
Size of Membership	445,000	373,500
Grades K-2	43%	
3-5	44%	
6-8	11%	
9-12	2%	
Boys	33%	5%
Girls	67%	95%
Ethnic Minorities	18%	8.5%

31

Camp Fire

Comments

Camp Fire's efforts to change the nature of its service population have resulted in increases in the percentage of boys (now 33% as compared to 5% in 1978) and minorities (18% - up from 8.5% in 1978) served.

As is the case in similar organizations, Camp Fire serves a relatively young population (88% 5th grade and under).

As in the scouting groups, Camp Fire councils report no government income, although a small percentage may be included in the funds they receive from grants and contracts.

While Camp Fire is one of the organizations still heavily dependent on United Way funds, the share of affiliate income from this source has steadily declined as it has in the other large organizations. This decline reflects not only diversification (so that the share from United Way drops as the percentage from other sources rises), but -- unlike other organizations -- the real dollar amount actually has dipped slightly in recent years.

Dues and fees, grants and contracts, and contributions have helped to offset the decline in United Way dollars.

TABLE #6

Child Welfare League of America

230 Voluntary Agencies Reporting in 1986

	1986 Dollars	1986 %	1980 %	1970 %	1960 %
Total Income	582,002,127				
Non-Governmental Sources					
United Way	60,756,295	10.4	9.0	17.8	23.6
Sectarian Federation	14,985,860	2.6			
Contributions, gifts, fundraising	35,563,128	6.1			
Foundations	11,879,489	2.0			
Client reimbursement for direct care costs	22,969,218	3.9			
Endowments, investments, trusts	43,268,698	7.4			
Fees from clients for service	25,583,004	4.4			
Reimbursements from volunteer agencies, insurance carriers, individuals	14,406,856	2.5			
Other	10,002,830	1.7			
Non-government Total	239,415,378	41.1			
Government Sources					
Payments for service on a case by case basis	283,676,288	48.7			
Other	58,910,461	10.1			
Government Total	342,586,749	58.9	62.0	42.6	28.1

Demographics

- Over 2 million children and their families
- High percentage of low income, single parent, no-parent families
- 51% White; 34% Black; 10% Hispanic; 2% Asian; 3% Other

Source: Sources of Agency Income, by Malm and Maza, CWLA, 1988

Child Welfare League of America

Comments

Unfortunately, the most recent reporting year for affiliates of CWLA is 1986. The report, nevertheless, provides some interesting insights, and corroborates impressions gathered elsewhere.

We do not have information on the number of adolescents in the service mix of CWLA member agencies. We do know that the mix includes large numbers of pre-schoolers, that many of the adolescents served have grown up in the child welfare system, and that these agencies serve the nation's most troubled young people.

Similar to other agencies that serve children and youth most at-risk, CWLA member agencies are highly dependent on government funds and considerably less so on United Way. At last report, they received 58.9% of their support from government and 10.4% from United Way. During the 1960's and 1970's government support increased -- from 28% in 1960 to 62% in 1980. By 1986 the share of government funds had declined to 58.9%; state and local increases did not fully replace decreases in federal funding.

United Way support, in contrast, steadily decreased from 23.6% in 1960 to a low of 9% in 1980. A slight increase was shown by 1986.

Smaller agencies in the CWLA network appear to be more dependent on United Way funds and less so on government than

larger agencies -- even when the most expensive residential care services are disregarded. And agencies in the South are far more dependent on non-government sources than other regions of the country, while Northeast agencies receive a higher percentage of their funds from government than other regions.

Private sector funds have not offset decreases in federal funds, leaving child welfare agencies at least as dependent -- perhaps more dependent -- on government funds in 1986 as they were in 1980.

TABLE #7

GIRL SCOUTS OF THE USA

	1989		1985	
Number of Councils	333			

Income

	1989		1985	
Total Income	$335,010,792		$243,164,782	
Sources	**Dollars**	**%**	**Dollars**	**%**
United Way	53,558,463	16	49,961,014	20.5
Program Income	36,367,385	10.8	26,910,859	11.1
(1) Product Sales	181,129,023	54	119,977,281	49.3
Investment	24,134,544	7.2	19,046,388	7.8
(2) Contributions	22,319,156	6.5	16,344,670	6.7
(3) Capital Campaign	4,891,854	1.5	3,208,735	1.3
Other	12,610,367	3.8	7,715,835	3.2

Demographics

Total members: 2,480,270

Age

	1989	1985
5-6 yrs	8%	2.9%
6-8 yrs	52%	53.3%
8-11 yrs	32%	34.8
11-14 yrs	7%	7.1%
14-17 yrs	2%	1.9%

Ethnic/Racial

15.7% minority (10.4% in 1979)

(4) Income 9% of families use food stamps
12% - one adult in household looking for work

Notes: (1) Cookies (2) legacies, bequests, individual giving, etc.
(3) special: oil well leases, timber, etc.
(4) Based on Harris survey of sample of girls over 8.

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.

Comments

GSUSA maintains good statistics on funding of local affiliates, and on the ages and racial/ethnic status of girls served, although, like most other organizations, little information is available on socio-economic status. A Harris survey, which excluded girls under 8 (60% of their membership) provides some information. Impressions are that clientele is largely middle class, although pro-active efforts have increased the minority population by 50% over a ten-year period.

Young adolescents make up a small percentage (7% ages 11-14) of girls served, and as girls reach ages 14-17 this percentage declines significantly (2%). 60% of Girls Scouts are 8 and under, and 5-6 year olds are the fastest growing age group in GSUSA, due in large part to increased outreach and program development for this group. This increase accounts, in large measure, for GSUSA's membership growth.

With regard to funding of local Councils, the most dramatic shift is in the decreasing percentage of support from United Ways (down by 4.5% over 5 years) and the concomitant increase in the percentage of support from product (cookie) sales (up by 5.7% in the same period). Of a $92 million increase in Council income from 1985 to 1989 only $3.6 million came from United Ways, while over $66 million came from cookie sales. One analytical cut which GSUSA takes is to look at girl-generated income (largely cookies) vs. adult-generated

(most other, excluding investments); the growth in girl-generated income over a 15-year period has far outstripped funds earned by adults. A dramatic change can be seen over a forty-year period, during which United Way's percentage of Girl Scout Council income has dropped from 85% to 16% while cookie sales have risen from 15% to 54%.

Income vs. expense data for local Councils was not collected for this report, but the national organization's 1990 support and revenue exceeded its expenses by $7.3 million, bringing its fund balance to $77.7 million. Major goals for GSUSA include increasing adult responsibility for financing, and the realization of a $21 million endowment fund corpus by the end of the century.

National headquarters provides important financial development tools, training and technical assistance to Councils.

Girl Scout officials cited several issues which affect local Council support:

- In addition to the decreased percentage of support obtained from United Way, which is apparent from the above figures, it was noted that the time devoted to the United Way campaign in some communities has been extended, and the restrictions on overlapping agency fundraising efforts severely exacerbate Councils' fundraising problems.
- There is increasing difficulty in getting funders to pay for indirect or overhead costs; "jigsaw puzzle

accounting" is required to attribute indirect items to direct costs.

- While Girl Scout Councils have not been dependent on government funds, the decrease in the level of government support for other organizations has increased the competition for other funds.
- While there is not a clear breakout for corporate support, the impression is that direct corporate support is not a significant portion of Councils' income, although corporate involvement is helpful in negotiation for the support of United Way and other sources.

TABLE #8

Junior Achievement

	1990	1985	1979/1980
Total income:	$51,685,434	$38 million approx.	$28 million approx.
Sources	%	%	%
Corporate	78	95	95
Foundation	2		
Special Events	17		
Other	3		
Demographics			
Total youth served	1,200,000	600,000	300,000
Grades 4 - 6	32%	28%	
7 - 9	42%	59%	
10 - 12	19%	13%	
Male	55%		
Female	45%		
White	68.5%		
Black	20%		
Hispanic	8%		
Asian	3%		
Native-American	0.5%		

Junior Achievement

Comments

Over the past five years, Junior Achievement has doubled the number of youth it serves -- and quadrupled the number over ten years. Nearly three-quarters of the youth served are between the ages of 9 and 14.

A shift from community-based services to school-based services appears to account in large part for the growth. And that shift in program locus is probably a major reason for the relatively large percentage of minorities and an apparent increase in youth living in at-risk circumstances reached by Junior Achievement.

In earlier years, through 1985, Junior Achievement was nearly totally dependent on corporate support. Their efforts at diversifying their sources of funds focused on special fund-raising events. Such events now account for 17% of Junior Achievement's income -- accompanying a drop of a like percentage in corporate support. This is not to suggest a decrease in corporate dollars, which still amounts to over 40 million dollars.

TABLE #9

National Network of Runaway and Youth Services

1989

(comparable data not available for previous years)

185 agencies reporting

Sources	Percent of Income
United Way	7%
Federal	22%
State	38%
County/local	16%
Corporations	2%
Individuals	4%
Foundations	4%
Special Events	3%
Other	4%

Demographics

Number served: 404,279

Ages:
- Under 14 - 38%
- 15-17 - 54%
- 18+19 - 6%
- 20 plus - 3%

Income Level:
- Poverty - 39%
- Working Class - 34%
- Middle Class - 21%
- Upper Middle Class - 6%

Race/Ethnicity:
- White - 64%
- Black - 20%
- Hispanic - 10%
- Other - 6%

Other: High level of substance abuse, physical and sexual abuse

National Network of Runaway and Youth Services

Comments

Table 9 is based upon reports from 185 reporting agencies some or which are coalitions that include additional agencies. Approximately 900 agencies exist, of which 300 are Network members. There are 339 federally funded runaway shelters.

Agencies which are part of the National Network do more than shelter runaway and homeless youth; averaging 14 different services per group, they are defined by the National Network as comprehensive community-based youth serving organizations.

Financially, these agencies are more heavily dependent on government funds than others, with 76% of their support coming from government -- 54% from state and local sources. Only 7% of their money is received from United Way. The number of federally-funded shelters rose from 120 in 1975 to 339 in 1989.

National Network agencies indicate that the increasing complexity of government regulations has increased their administrative costs, as has the high cost of liability insurance. Further, it would appear that the fact that over half of their support comes from state and local government would make them

National Network of Runaway and Youth Services

Comments

Table 9 is based upon reports from 185 reporting agencies some of which are coalitions that include additional agencies. Approximately 900 agencies exist, of which 300 are Network members. There are 339 federally funded runaway shelters.

Agencies which are part of the National Network do more than shelter runaway and homeless youth; averaging 14 different services per group, they are defined by the National Network as comprehensive community-based youth serving organizations. It is interesting that, while there is no doubt that the young people they serve are among America's most vulnerable, and include a higher proportion of poor and minority youth than are in the general population, they also serve a higher percentage of white and non-poor youth than other national organizations that target the inner-city.

Financially, these agencies are more heavily dependent on government funds than others, with 76% of their support coming from government -- 54% from state and local sources. Only 7% of their money is received from United Way. The number of federally-funded shelters rose from 120 in 1975 to 339 in 1989.

National Network agencies indicate that the increasing complexity of government regulations has increased their administrative costs, as has the high cost of liability insurance. Further, it would appear that the fact that over half of their support comes from state and local government would make them

particularly vulnerable as these governmental entities face larger and larger deficits and cutbacks.

It is interesting to note that, among their sources of support, there is no line for dues and fees.

As in the case of other organizations, core support is difficult to obtain. And while these agencies do not find private sources of funding as plentiful as public sources, many juggle numerous funding sources. One agency reported 64 different funding sources.

TABLE #10

National Urban League

1989

Total affilate income: $ 149.5 million

Sources	Dollars (in millions)	%
Government	83.5	55.9
United Way	33.7	22.5
Restricted foundation/ corporate grants	15.5	10.4
Unrestricted contributions	4.8	3.2
Other (special events, sales, legacies, etc.)	12.0	8.0

Total Funds for Children's/ Adolescent Services	Dollars	% of all funds
	49.6	33.2
By Type		
Basic (United Way and unrestricted)	10.7	7.2
Special Project Grants	38.9	26.0
By Age		
0 - 12 years	15.6	10.4
13 - 24 years	15.2	10.2
Undifferentiated	18.8	12.6

Funds for Children & Youth Developmental/Preventive Programs	Dollars	% of Children's/ Adolescent Support
	15.0	30.3

Demographics:

85.0% African-American
43.8% low income
50.0% one parent families (43.4% female-headed)
35.6% of youth unemployed

National Urban League

Comment:

The National Urban League prepared an extensive special report for the Task Force on Youth Development and Community Programs. The full report, combining 1989 funding and program data with information gathered in a 1991 survey is in the Project files. A 1986 League report containing detailed information, also is available, but, for the most part, has not been used here because the use of different methods in 1986 makes comparisons with 1989 unreliable.

The sources of funds listed in Table 10 are for overall National Urban League activities. It is not possible to determine which source's funds were used for which portion of youth services. But the League does estimate that one-third of its funds supported services to children and adolescents, that nearly one-third of these funds were used for developmental/preventive programs -- split evenly between those under 12 years of age and those between 13 and 24. In 1986, children and youth under 22 (the category in use at that time) comprised 22% of clients served.

Approximately 30% of funds utilized in the service of children and youth were used to support a set of 22 programs the League identifies as developmental/preventive. 72% of all youth funding went into Education and Employment and Training Programs; of restricted funds for Education 66% were for Early Childhood Education.

In terms of overall funding, the League differs from the pattern emerging in the national youth serving organizations, in that relatively high percentages of its support come from both government (55.9%) and United Way (22.5%).

Local Leagues identify Youth Development as their third most important concern.

Leagues are working hard to increase membership and business support, and entering into service consortia which reduce overhead costs.

The NUL notes several impediments to appropriate funding of youth services:

- the shift away from general support to project funding
- greater competition
- the advantage single focus organizations have in being able to identify more easily with a funder's focus
- the credibility gap which continues to exist, in terms of mistrust of human service management
- the fact that few funders will provide more than one to three years' funding, although programs require longer time frames.

TABLE #11

YMCA OF THE USA

		1990		1986	
(1)	Number of units: 898 YMCA's				
		Income			
	Totals	$ 1,438,455,518		$ 983,347,843	
(2)	Sources	Dollars	%	Dollars	%
	General Contributions	21,037,018	1.5		
	Special Events	14,720,292	1.0		
	Legacies/Bequests	8,897,619	0.6		
(3)	Other organizations	5,611,646	0.4		
	United Way	96,166,491	6.7	81,733,425	8.3
(4)	Annual Campaign	49,604,924	3.4	31,806,387	3.2
	Foundation Grants	11,334,968	0.8		
	Total Contributed	207,372,958	14.4		
	Membership Dues	434,953,323	30.2	292,315,599	29.7
(5)	Program fees	297,292,937	20.7	297,211,463	30.2
	Child Care fees	202,821,797	14.1		
	Resident Camp	86,281,430	6.0		
	Residence Revenue	60,991,570	4.2		
	Sales & Food Service	25,582,648	1.8		
	Total Earned Income	1,107,923,705	77.0		
(6)	Gov't contracts	78,031,528	5.4	46,947,259	5.0
	Investments	26,868,985	1.9		
	World Service	1,531,205	0.0		
	Miscellaneous	16,727,137	1.2		
	Total other	123,158,855	8.6		

TABLE #11 (cont'd)

Demographics

	1989		1986	
(7) Total Served	12,784,886		12,582,751	
Ages	Numbers	%	Numbers	%
1-5 yrs	1,366,293	10.7	1,390,297	11.0
6-11 yrs	3,168,054	24.8	3,035,345	24.1
12-17 yrs	1,554,430	12.2	1,465,743	11.6
Total under 18	6,088,777	47.6	5,891,385	46.8
18-19 yrs	2,047,116	16.0	2,296,510	18.3
30-54	3,452,772	27.0	3,187,703	25.3
55-64	647,163	5.1	733,605	5.8
65 +	549,058	4.3	473,548	3.8
Total 18 and over	6,696,109	52.4	6,691,366	53.2

Notes:
(1) 898 of 959 corporate YMCA's reporting; 2,069 total associations include these plus 1,110 branches
(2) 1986 data on selected items only
(3) Rotary, etc.
(4) Usually 3-4 month campaign
(5) In 1986, Program Fees included child care fees
(6) In 1986, government contracts and foundation grants were combined.
(7) Figures include both Y members and other registered program participants.

YMCA OF THE USA

Comments:

It should be noted that, despite its title, the YMCA of the USA's service population is not overwhelmingly young men. In fact, 46.8% of those it serves are female. And while 37% of those served are between 6 and 17 years, 52.4% are 18 or over. The greatest decrease in population served over the past five years appears to be in the 18-29 and 55-64 age groups, while significant increases appear in the 6-17 and over 65-year-old groups.

The fact that YMCAs serve "womb to tomb" and do not account for income or expenses by age group served makes it difficult to assess the amount of resources directed to youth. Nevertheless, the YMCA of the USA's service to nearly five million young people from 6 to 17 years of age in a network of over 2000 associations makes it a significant player in the youth-serving field. The organization has recently recommitted itself to youth programming, targeting hard-to-reach and troubled teens.

As with other organizations, United Way dollars have increased (by nearly $15 million in five years) but Y's are less dependent on those dollars as a share of total income (down from 8.3% in 1986 to 6.7% in 1990). Significant increases in income are shown in fees for service and independent fund-raising campaigns. The YMCA of the USA anticipates increased national fund-raising efforts in cooperation with local units.

The YMCA of the USA's experience points up the difficulty in generalizing from the data, and the way in which extraordinary experiences of selected affiliates may skew the overall figures. Examples: In the past year, one-third of the local Y's experienced a decrease in United Way support, while overall United Way support increased 2%. Likewise, in a year when 31% of Y's providing child care experienced a decrease in income, overall child care revenue went up 28%, largely due to a huge increase in such revenue in one large city.

The YMCA of the USA collects no information on income level or race/ethnicity of those it serves.

2. Community-based Studies

For another view of funding patterns as reported by recipient agencies, we asked The Johns Hopkins University Institute for Policy Studies to do a special analysis of youth-serving agencies surveyed in 1982 by the Urban Institute and in 1990 by the Johns Hopkins University in six metropolitan areas. In the section of this report which follows, we have supplemented information about these six metropolitan areas, with data on a seventh area -- Boston, Massachusetts -- from a report prepared by the Social Policy Research Group, Inc. entitled "Primer on Human Services in Boston; The Impact of the Massachusetts Fiscal Crisis on Human Services in Boston."

The Johns Hopkins University data are particularly instructive. In 1982, the Urban Institute, under the leadership of Dr. Lester M. Salamon, initiated a major project to examine the scope and structure of the private nonprofit sector in the United States. The Institute collected data in sixteen local sites from 3,412 agencies considered to be public benefit human service nonprofits. A follow-up survey was conducted two years later. In 1990, Dr. Salamon, now at The Johns Hopkins University, conducted a survey in six of the twelve metropolitan areas included in the earlier study. These sites -- Atlanta, Chicago, Minneapolis/St. Paul (twin cities), Phoenix, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco -- represented a broad geographic spread and the bulk of responses in the earlier work (61.3% of the 1982 survey). 1,626 nonprofits (including some affiliates of national organizations) returned completed questionnaires, yielding an overall response rate of 23.7%.

For the Carnegie Council Project, The Johns Hopkins University drew data on youth-serving agencies from the 1982 and 1990 surveys for the six metropolitan areas included in the 1990 survey; both years, thus, are comparable in their geographic representation. To identify youth-serving organizations, all organizations were included that indicated that more than half of their clients were between the ages of 12 and 19. In 1982, 7.7% (135 of 1,753) of the agencies fit the criteria, while in 1990, the figure was 7.9% (115 of 1,453). Some agencies included in the 1982 sample may not be included in the 1990 data simply because they dropped slightly below the 50% mark.

In the material presented below, sources of revenue include government, fees and dues, and a variety of private and other sources. For certain calculations, deflation factors to 1981 dollars were applied, in order to achieve a view of constant dollars. (Note: Of the various sources cited in this study, only the Johns Hopkins University data are reported in constant dollars).

Six tables are presented and discussed below. Tables 12, 13, 14 and 15 deal with the nature of the youth-serving agencies included in The Johns Hopkins University study -- their size, age and services. Tables 16 and 17 deal with the funding sources of those agencies. There is also a brief discussion of the extent to which these agencies serve poor youth.

TABLE #12

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF YOUTH-SERVING AGENCIES ACCORDING TO EXPENDITURE SIZE IN 1981 AND 1989

Expenditure Size in 1981 dollars	Fiscal Year 1981 Number of Agencies	1981 %	Fiscal Year 1989 Number of Agencies	1989 %
Under $100,000	25	21.0	34	31.5
$100,000 - $1 Million	76	63.9	52	48.2
Over $1 Million	18	15.1	22	20.4
Total	119	100.0	108	100.0

Source: Salamon/Urban Institute Nonprofit Sector Project 1982; The Johns Hopkins Nonprofit Sector Project, 1990

TABLE #13

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF YOUTH-SERVING AGENCIES
BY YEAR OF FORMATION: 1982 AND 1990

Year Formed	1982		1990	
	Number	%	Number	%
Before 1930	20	14.9	11	9.6
1931 - 1960	20	14.9	15	13.0
1961 - 1970	35	26.1	20	17.4
1971 - 1980	56	41.8	48	41.7
After 1980	3	2.2	21	18.3
Total	134	100.00	115	100.00

Source: Salamon/Urban Institute Nonprofit Sector Project 1982; The Johns Hopkins Nonprofit Sector Project, 1990.

TABLE #14

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF YOUTH-SERVING AGENCIES
BY PRIMARY SERVICE AREA: 1982 AND 1990

Primary Service Area[1]	1982	1990
Social Services	16.5	19.4
Mental Health	3.0	1.9
Health	2.3	2.9
Institutional/Residential Care	21.8	11.7
Research & Education	18.0	15.5
Housing	0.8	3.9
Employment/Training/Jobs	8.3	4.8
Legal Services	0.0	1.9
Arts & Culture	15.0	12.6
Multiservice	14.3	25.2
Total	100.0	100.0
(n)	(133)	(103)

[1]Defined as service type in which agency expends more than 50% of its funds. Multiservice agencies do not have one principal service area.

Source: Salamon/Urban Institute Nonprofit Sector Project 1982; The Johns Hopkins Nonprofit Sector Project, 1990.

57

TABLE #15

TYPES OF SERVICES PROVIDED BY YOUTH-SERVING AGENCIES IN 1982 AND 1990

	Percent provide service in:	
Type of Service	1982	1990
Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention	38.5	32.2
Suicide Prevention	n.a	7.8
Alcohol Abuse		13.0
	18.5	30.4
Drug and Substance Abuse		17.4
Crisis Intervention	23.0	7.8[1]
Employment/Vocational Counseling	16.3	17.4
Dropout Prevention	n.a	18.3
Sports and Recreation	14.8	13.9
Youth Club or Activity	20.0	22.6
Camping	23.0	13.0
Cultural/Ethnic Awareness	n.a.	13.9
(n)	(135)	(115)

n.a. = not available

[1] Hotline crisis intervention only in 1990

Source: Salamon/Urban Institute Nonprofit Sector Project 1982; The Johns Hopkins Nonprofit Sector Project, 1990

Table 12 above shows an increase both in small ($100,000 expenditures and under) and large (over $1,000,000) agencies, together with a concomitant decrease in both the number and percentage of medium-sized agencies. Since we do not have agency by agency comparisons, it is difficult to say with certainty what happened to participating agencies in terms of their growth. How many of the agencies in the medium category did not report for 1989, how many went out of business, and how many moved into either the small or large category? We are not certain. It is possible that the growth in the number and percentage of small agencies could be attributed to a drop in the budgets of agencies which were previously in the medium category, or it could be that the small category tends to include newer, fledgling agencies (see Table 13).

Aside from the unlikely possibility that agencies which reported over a million dollars in expenditures for 1989 did not report at all for 1981, it seems appropriate to conclude that a number of agencies moved up from the medium to the large category. This would suggest that medium to large agencies were those most likely to grow, that organizations which have a relatively stable financial base and may be more experienced and sophisticated fund raisers are better able to make the necessary connection between their needs and the interests of funders, and to maintain and attract even more dollars.

From the report of the Social Policy Research Group, Inc. (SPRG) we learn that in Boston, youth service agencies tend to

be larger than other human service agencies. Half of the agencies serving youth in Boston have budgets larger than $1.8 million. 75% of all youth dollars are concentrated in 16 large agencies (28 of 31 agencies reporting).

With regard to Table 13, one must, of course, discount the 1982 figures for agencies formed after 1980, since so little of the decade had passed. Even so, by 1990 a relatively modest number of agencies formed in the previous decade had reported. The 1970s were the time when the largest number of agencies were formed, with what appears to be a fairly good survival rate through 1990. Of interest are the periods before 1930 and between 1961 and 1970. A considerable drop in the number and percentage of agencies formed in those time periods and still existing in 1990 (or at least reporting) is shown. Does that suggest that the older agencies lost steam, couldn't keep up, adapt, stay relevant? It is interesting to note that in Boston, according to the SPRG report, youth service agencies tend to be older than other human service agencies, and (not surprisingly, given Boston's special place in the history of charity) more older agencies still existed in 1990, with 36% of the youth-serving agencies founded before 1950.

Tables 14 and 15 deal with the services provided by agencies whose clients include more than 50% youth. Table 14, in which agencies are characterized by the type of service in which they expend the majority of their funds, shows a dramatic decrease in institutional/residential care. The obvious inference is that this shows the effect of deinstitutionalization during

the 1980s; it is possible that it may also reflect changes in reimbursement procedures on the part of health insurance companies, or the consolidation of agencies through mergers which are being promoted by funders in many communities, or change in status to multi-service agencies. Agencies whose primary service area was employment/training/jobs decreased also, as did arts and culture agencies which, in The Johns Hopkins University terms, includes recreation facilities, camping, and youth clubs.

Agencies which describe themselves as multi-service showed an increase. Of course, this could simply be definitional -- or it could indicate either (a) the adoption of more holistic approaches or (b) program diversification to attract new funding sources.

Table 15 shows the variety of types of services provided by youth serving agencies in 1982 and 1990. Some categories shown in 1990 (cultural/ethnic, suicide prevention, dropout prevention) simply were not asked for in the 1982 survey but that does not mean that those services were not being offered. Here, as elsewhere, much depends upon what questions researchers asked, and how they asked them. For example, in the SPRG study of Boston youth-serving agencies, the services identified as offered by most organizations are case management, recreational programs, and youth development and employment programs. The youth-serving agencies in the six metropolitan areas covered by The Johns Hopkins University study responded to a different set of categories put to them. The sharp drop in crisis intervention services must be discounted because in 1990 this category was limited to hot-line crisis intervention only.

The hardiest of the service categories in Table 15 appears to be juvenile justice and delinquency prevention, with the largest percentage of agencies providing services in this area consistently over the decade. There is a considerable increase in the percentage of agencies providing alcohol, drug and substance abuse services (from 18.5% in 1982 to 30.4% in 1990). The percentage of agencies reporting camping as a service dropped considerably over the period.

What accounts for the changes in services which agencies provide, and to what extent do agencies really change the nature of their services as compared to merely changing the name given to them? If, for example, agencies report increased services in the area of alcohol and substance abuse, is this a real response to an increasing societal problem? Or do some agencies tend to change the label they put on services to accommodate to what will "sell" to the funders and the public? Why would a service such as camping decrease? Perhaps because it has less glamour and is less supportable? Perhaps because it is intensive and expensive and less supportable?

Next, Tables 16 and 17 provide a look at the funding sources of the youth-serving agencies in the six metropolitan areas covered in the Hopkins survey.

TABLE #16

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF AGGREGATE REVENUE OF YOUTH-SERVING AGENCIES BY SOURCE: 1981 AND 1989

Source of Revenue	Fiscal Year 1981		1989	
Government	45.5		46.6	
Fees and Dues	19.4		22.1	
All Private	26.8		19.9	
Individuals		7.8		6.1
Corporations		5.1		4.4
Foundations		4.4		4.2
United Way		5.5		4.5
Religious		3.8		0.5
Other Federated		0.2		0.2
All Other	8.2		11.3	
Sale of Products		n.a		3.1
Endowment/Investment		6.7		2.2
Fund-raising		n.a		3.9
Other		1.5		2.1
Total	100.00		100.0	
(n)	(115)		(103)	
Average Revenue	$492,769		$1,056,356 (real dollars)	
			$786,142 (1981 dollars)	
Median Revenue	$280,000		$268,620 (1981 dollars)	

n.a. - data not available separately from "other" category.

Source: Salamon/Urban Institute Nonprofit Sector Project 1982; The Johns Hopkins Nonprofit Sector Project, 1990

TABLE #17

PERCENT YOUTH-SERVING AGENCIES RECEIVING ANY SUPPORT FROM SOURCE AND AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED: 1981 AND 1989

	1981		1989	
Source:	Percent Receive Support	Average Amount of Support*	Percent Receive Support	Average Amount of Support*
Government	66.9%	$331,710	61.3%	$596,948
Fees & Dues	53.2	170,364	51.9	347,947
Individuals	52.4	70,434	73.6	67,092
Corporations	43.6	53,298	58.5	60,688
Foundations	50.0	40,307	58.5	58,023
United Way	20.2	123,111	36.8	98,852
Religious	16.9	110,873	19.8	19,208
Other Federated	5.7	18,618	7.6	24,265
Sale of Products	n.a	n.a	29.3	86,207
Endowment/Investment	33.9	90,164	31.1	54,917
Fund-raising	n.a	n.a	55.7	57,892
Other	21.8	32,140	22.6	68,844
(n)	(124)	(77)	(106)	(65)

*In 1981 dollars

Source: Salamon/Urban Institute Nonprofit Sector Project 1982; The Johns Hopkins Nonprofit Sector Project, 1990

Tables 16 and 17, which compare fiscal years 1981 and 1989, point up some interesting issues.

Table 16 shows a significant rise in the revenue of youth-serving agencies between 1981 and 1989. Average budgets rose, in real dollars, from under half million dollars to over one million dollars. Even in 1981 dollars, the average agency budget rose by an amazing 60%!

Compare this with the median figures which actually dropped by 4%. The lower median suggests that more small agencies are in the mix in 1989, and the mean is pushed higher by a smaller number of agencies with high revenues. In the six communities surveyed, the bulk of agencies' revenue actually may have decreased in constant dollars, while a few large agencies showed a considerable increase. ("Them what has, gets.")

An analysis of the sources of revenue shows that, in constant 1981 dollars, income from every source rose, with the exception of "religious" and "endowment/investment," but the share of income received from different sources shows some variation.

Perhaps most significant in terms of the share of the income is the rise in the categories labeled "fees and dues" and "all other". This includes all revenue other than government and private giving, and thus might be considered earned revenue. If one looks, for example, at "fees and dues" one will see an increase of only 2.7%. But in constant 1981 dollars, income earned from this source rose by 80%. The increase in "fees and dues" and "all other" suggests a conscious and successful effort

on the part of youth-serving agencies to increase income from dues and from goods and services for which they charge.

The increase in these areas together with a slight increase in the percentage of support which comes from government is accompanied by a decrease in the percentage of revenue received from private sources -- individuals, corporations, foundations, and United Way. The agencies surveyed are less dependent upon philanthropic sources such as these as a percentage of their revenue.

It will come as a surprise to some that government support for youth-serving agencies in these metropolitan areas rose both as a percentage of their overall revenue and in terms of constant dollars. These agencies continued to get nearly half of their revenue from governmental sources.

The SPRG study in Boston also shows a heavy dependence on government funds, with 67% of the support for private agencies providing youth services coming from government. 53% came from state contracts while 8% came from city sources and 4% from federal sources (2% from Medicaid and Medicare). These figures provide us with a warning about our interpretation of government dollars. It is probable that a considerable amount of federal dollars are included in the state contract funds in the Boston study. We have no idea in Table 16 above, how much of the government revenue, which is 46.6%, came from federal, state, county or city sources. And, as indicated earlier in this report, we have uncovered no national source of data about state or local government funds which go to private youth-serving

agencies. The figures from all seven geographic areas reported upon here, however, suggest that state dollars may support a considerable share of private youth services. Further study of the extent of state support would appear warranted.

Table 17 presents a somewhat different perspective. It deals with the percentage of youth-serving agencies which received any support from a particular source and the average amount received in 1981 and 1989 in constant 1981 dollars. It should be noted that in each reporting year, of the organizations which reported receiving any funding from given sources, only slightly above 60% provided sufficient information to determine the amount of funding.

The percentage of agencies receiving governmental support dropped some, but the average amount of the support per agency receiving government funds rose by $238,238 or 72%. These data, in conjunction with the data from Table 12, suggest again that the larger agencies are receiving increasing amounts of support from government sources.

Over half of the youth-serving agencies in these six metropolitan areas (slightly down from 1981) received some of their support from fees and dues; in the organizations which do charge for membership and services, the average agency received twice as many constant dollars from their members and service recipients in 1989 as they did in 1981. This corroborates similar findings obtained from Table 16.

Increased diversification of funding sources is indicated by the data relating to private giving. The percentage of agencies receiving support from each category in this area

(individuals, corporations, foundations, United Way, religious, and other federated) increased. The size of the average contribution from corporations, foundations and other federated sources increased. The average amount of support from individuals went down slightly.

In sharp contrast to other sources (except individuals and investments), the rise in the percentage of agencies receiving United Way support was matched by a significant decrease in the average amount of that support.

And inexplicably, while a somewhat higher percentage of agencies received religious support, the average amount dropped from $110,873 in 1981 to $19,208 in 1989. Again these figures are corroborated by data from Table 16.

The increased percentage of agencies receiving grants, donations and allocations from charitable sources is consistent with reports received from donees, which indicate increased competition in this particular marketplace.

Finally, a look at revenue from endowments and investments reveals a modest drop in the percentage of organizations which do receive revenue from this source, and a considerable drop in the average amount of revenue received from this source. Two-thirds of the agencies in the study receive no investment or endowment income. The decrease in the dollars received by those agencies which do have investment or endowment income reflects, perhaps, changing interest rates and/or dipping into and depleting the corpus, resulting in smaller annual revenue from this source.

* * *

Neither The Johns Hopkins University study nor the Social Policy Research Group Study offered much information regarding the characteristics of clients served by the youth agencies.

In Boston, 65% of the clients served by the agencies offering services to youth were nonwhite (17% Hispanic, 6% Asian, 36% African American, 6% other). We did not receive ethnic or racial data from the six metropolitan areas covered in The Johns Hopkins University study, but they did provide some data on income level. The youth-serving agencies, along with the others covered in the six metropolitan areas were asked whether they served a primarily poor constituency (more than 50% of their clientele). Of 114 agencies responding in 1982, 26.3% indicated that they served a primarily poor population. In 1990, 100 youth serving agencies responded to this question. By that time, the percentage serving a primarily poor population had risen to 42%.

3. United Way and Government Support

Still relying on data supplied by service-delivery agencies and the studies referenced in A-1 and A-2 above, Table 18 is intended to bring into bold relief differences in the characteristics of agencies which receive higher and lower shares of their revenues from government and United Way.

In addition to the percentages of revenue received from government and United Way by affiliates of selected national organizations, this table also includes notes on other income received and includes, for comparative purposes, the same data for agencies surveyed in The Johns Hopkins University study.

TABLE #18

UNITED WAY & GOVERNMENT REVENUE AS PERCENTAGES OF ALL REVENUE FOR SELECTED ORGANIZATIONS (Most recent reporting year) (1)

	United Way Support	Government Support	Selected Other Support
ASPIRA Association	5.2%	68.2%	25% Corporations/ Foundations
Big Brothers/ Big Sisters of America	38.3%	9%	20% Contributions/ Grants 37% Special Events
Boy Scouts of America	25%	0	31% Contributions 25% Fees 18% Other
Boys & Girls Clubs of America	34%	8%	9% Dues & Fees 32% Contributions/ Grants
Camp Fire	33.6%	Unknown	25.4% Dues & Fees 17.5% Sales 5.8% Grants, Contracts
Child Welfare League of America	10.4%	58.9%	9.8% Client & 3rd party reimbursement 2% Foundations 61% Contributions; fundraising
Girl Scouts of the USA	16%	0	54% Sales 11% Program Income 6.5% Contributions
National Network of Runaway & Youth Services	7%	76% (2)	13.6% Contributions/ Grants 3% Special events
National Urban League	22.5%	55.9%	13.6% Contributions/ Grants 8% Other
YMCA of the USA	7%	5%	77% Dues & Fees 3.4% Annual Campaign

TABLE #18 (cont'd)

Agencies represented in Johns Hopkins U. Study	4.5%	46.6%	22.1% Dues & Fees 15.4% Contributions/Grants 11.3% Sales, Endowments, Fund-raising, other

(1) See tables 1 through 11 for most recent reporting year

(2) Half federal; half state and local

72

Table #18 indicates that five national organizations which are exclusively child and youth serving organizations, primarily oriented to youth development, as opposed to treatment, received a relatively small portion of their income from governmental sources (zero to nine percent). These organizations -- Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America, Boy Scouts of America, Boys and Girls Clubs of America, Camp Fire and Girl Scouts of the USA -- whose percentage of revenue from United Way has been declining in recent years, nevertheless continue to receive significant portions of their revenue from United Ways. The percentages of their revenue received from United Ways range from 16 to 38%.

Two organizations that serve significant numbers of young people but are not exclusively youth serving organizations do not fit this picture. The YMCA of the USA receives relatively little money either from government or the United Way; the lion's share of its revenue comes from dues and fees. On the other hand, the Urban Leagues receive high percentages of revenue both from the government and United Ways; 78.4% comes from these sources.

When the sources of revenue for youth serving agencies included in The Johns Hopkins University study are compared with the affiliates of the five large national youth serving organizations, one sees quite an interesting picture. For these agencies, government support is the most significant (46.6%) and

United Way support is quite low (4.5%) -- just the reverse of the five national youth serving organizations.

Affiliates of the National Network of Runaway and Youth Services, the Child Welfare League of America and the ASPIRA Association, show a pattern similar to those agencies in the six metropolitan areas in The Johns Hopkins University Study. 56% to 68% of their funds comes from governmental sources while only 5% to 10% is received from United Way.

What emerges here again is an indication that youth-serving agencies affiliated with some of the well known national organizations are able to command a larger portion of United Way dollars, and that they receive fewer governmental dollars. Two explanations may help to account for the differences between (a) the national organizations and (b) the local organizations in The Johns Hopkins study and those who are affiliates of the National Network, CWLA and ASPIRA.

The affiliates of the three latter organizations as well as the groups surveyed by Johns Hopkins tend to be smaller, independent agencies which don't carry the recognizable names which accompany chapters or franchises of certain well-known national youth serving organizations. Organizations which have been recognized in the United Way allocations process over the years continue to be more significant beneficiaries of United Way funds (even though their efforts at diversification have resulted in United Way percentages dropping compared to other

sources of income). Smaller agencies without that history have not fared as well.

A second explanation is related to the issue of government support. This deals with the types of agencies likely to be included in the Johns Hopkins Study and the types of services they offer. Remember that the way we selected agencies from among those surveyed by Johns Hopkins was to include only those whose client population comprised 51% or more youth, ages 12 - 19. We suspect that there may be a difference in the types of services these agencies provided and the characteristics of the youth they served, as compared to the affiliates of the national youth-serving organizations. It is likely that many of these agencies focused on short-term intervention in or long-term treatment of problem behavior, as compared to more generalized youth development services. The same may apply to agencies affiliated with the National Network, ASPIRA and CWLA.

While we have a fairly good picture of the services provided by the national youth serving organizations, there is no way to distinguish among the services provided by the agencies in The Johns Hopkins University cohort. But the pattern shown by the affiliates of the National Network, ASPIRA and CWLA tends to corroborate our assumption about the agencies included in The Johns Hopkins University study. And since governmental support, whether local, state or federal, is likely to come in the form of contracts or grants to deal with particular categorical problems, rather than youth development activities, it

would follow that independent community-based agencies which focus on such areas would be more dependent upon government funds.

If these assumptions are correct, Urban Leagues would appear to bridge both worlds; their name recognition and affiliation with a prominent national organization brings them a significant percentage of United Way funds, and the type of services they provide to young people fits the purposes for which categorical funds are awarded by government agencies.

B. Organizations Which Provide Support

An effort was made to understand further the funding of youth development services by gathering information from major sources of such support.

The three major sources examined in this section are foundations, United Way, and government.

1. The Foundation Center

Our major sources of information about foundation funding were the Foundation Grants Indexes published by the Foundation Center. The brief analyses contained in each Foundation Grant Index do not examine support for youth development programs in a way which is meaningful for this Project. Some reference is made in each index to the broad category of "funding for children and youth", but we wanted to focus more directly on the agencies and the population targeted by the project. To do this, we asked the Foundation Center to conduct a special search

for us, using both the 1990/1991 Grants Index, which was the latest one available, and the 1984 Grants Index, which was the earliest one useful for comparative purposes.

It must be understood that the Foundation Grants Indexes do not report on all grants. They include only grants of $5,000 and more from the nation's largest foundations. In 1984, the Index reported on grants from 465 foundations, including the 101 largest foundations in the country. This represents only 2% of the active grant-making foundations, but it represents 45% of the annual dollars awarded. The 1990/1991 Index reported on 472 foundations included the nation's one hundred largest foundations. This represented only 1.6% of the total number of active grant-making foundations, but represented 44% of all dollars awarded.

It should be pointed out further that it was not possible to separate grants to national headquarters of national organizations from grants to their affiliates. In some instances, grants to each affiliate are listed separately but in others, such as the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., all grants to national and local components of these organizations are combined in the report we received.

The manner in which the Foundation Center organizes its data has changed over the years. By the time the 1990/1991 index was issued, the Foundation Center was using the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE) grants classification scheme, which did not exist in 1984. Using this as a starting point, we attempted to find comparable information from the earlier index.

The Foundation Center conducted a special search of recipient organizations as follows:

The NTEE classification includes a major area entitled Youth Development. The Foundation Center supplied us with a list of all organizations in this category from the 1990/91 Index, and a list of similar organizations from the 1984 index. We asked for no further breakdown in this area, assuming that since this category was entitled Youth Development, it was not necessary to ask for further breakdown by age nor was it possible to get the specific ages in which the project was interested.

But all youth development work is not done by agencies whose purposes are primarily youth development. Consequently, we asked the Foundation Center for a second search. Here we selected 20 code areas which had the potential for falling within the Project's areas of interest. These categories were:

- Drop-outs
- Substance Abuse, Prevention
- Crisis Services, Suicide
- Delinquency, prevention/services
- Camps
- Recreation, community facilities
- American Red Cross
- Urban League
- Salvation Army
- Volunteers of America
- YM/YWCAs and YM/YWHA's
- Neighborhood Centers
- Youth, pregnancy prevention
- Youth, services
- Human services
- Christian agencies and churches
- Protestant agencies and churches
- Roman Catholic agencies and churches
- Jewish agencies and temples
- Religion

Since these categories crossed all age groups, the Foundation Center cross-referenced them with five population codes (children and youth; youth; girls and young women; youth - female; and youth - male), providing us with a report which

listed grants to human service organizations which provided services in the areas listed above to these younger population groups.

The Foundation Center has little information on other characteristics of populations targeted by grants. There is no information on socio-economic characteristics of such populations, but there is some information on the minority status, and in each of the two search categories, we asked the Foundation Center to provide us also with information about grants targeted specifically at minority groups.

The reports received from the Foundation Center are summarized in Tables 19, 20, 21, and 22.

TABLE #19

ORGANIZATIONS RECEIVING FOUNDATION GRANTS OF $5,000 AND OVER FOR YOUTH PROGRAMS

	1990/1991			1984		
Recipient	Number	Total Dollars	Avg. Grant	Number	Total Dollars	Avg. Grant
YOUTH DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS	970	40,031,671	41,270	313	7,897,629	25,232
% OF ALL YOUTH GRANTS	53.4%	57.7%		47%	44.6%	
GRANTS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH TO OTHER HUMAN SERVICE ORGS.	845	29,334,681	34,716	353	9,823,330	27,828
% OF ALL YOUTH GRANTS	46.6%	42.3%		53%	55.4%	
TOTALS	1,815	69,366,352	38,218	666	17,720,959	26,608

SOURCE: THE FOUNDATION GRANTS INDEX, 13TH EDITION (1984) and 19th EDITION (1990/1991)

TABLE #20

GRANTS FOR YOUTH AS A SHARE OF
ALL FOUNDATION GRANTS OF $5000 AND OVER

	1990/1991			1984		
	NUMBER	DOLLARS	AVG GRANT	NUMBER	DOLLARS	AVG. GRANT
ALL GRANTS	46,431	3,254,247,000	70,087	32,165	1,792,519,313	55,729
YOUTH GRANTS	1,815 (3.9%)	69,366,352 (2.13%)	38,218 (54.5%)	666 (2.07%)	17,720,959 (1%)	26,680 (47.7%)

SOURCE: THE FOUNDATION GRANTS INDEX, 13TH EDITION (1984)
AND 19TH EDITION (1990/1991)

82

83

TABLE #21

TABLE #3

NUMBER OF YOUTH GRANTS TO SELECTED RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS

	1990/1991	1984
BIG BROTHERS/BIG SISTERS	67	10
BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA	179	7
BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS	185	20
GIRL SCOUTS OF THE USA	101	1
JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT	103	111
SUB-TOTAL	635	150
ALL OTHER YOUTH DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS	335	163
TOTAL	970	313

SOURCE: THE FOUNDATION GRANTS INDEX, 13TH EDITION (1984) AND 19TH EDITION (1990/1991)

TABLE #22

NUMBER OF
GRANTS FOR YOUTH FOR SELECTED
POPULATION GROUPS

	1990/1991	1984
YOUTH DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS		
MINORITY - GENERAL	31	8
ASIAN	3	0
BLACK	13	0
HISPANIC	19	2
NATIVE AMERICAN	4	0
GRANTS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH TO OTHER HUMAN SERVICE ORGS.		
MINORITY - GENERAL	39	12
ASIAN	0	2
BLACK	28	7
HISPANIC	9	6
NATIVE AMERICAN	0	0
TOTALS	146	37

NOTE: GRANTS WHICH SPECIFY MORE THAN ONE POPULATION GROUP MAY BE COUNTED UNDER EACH.

SOURCE: THE FOUNDATION GRANTS INDEX, 13TH EDITION (1984) AND 19TH EDITION (1990/1991)

It should be noted that the dollar figures cited in Tables 19-22 are in terms of real dollars, and have not been adjusted for to account for inflation. Despite this, and despite the somewhat imprecise data which serve as the basis for the tables, some interesting trends can be discerned.

First, grants for youth development programs rose in real dollars, and in numbers. The total dollars rose nearly fourfold between 1984 and 1990 (from 17.7 million dollars to 69.4 million dollars). In 1990 over two and a half times the number of grants were awarded for these purposes as were awarded in 1984. The average size of the grants was 44% larger than the average size of grants reported in the 1984 index.

Second, within the youth grants, there was a shift in the proportion of such grants which went to the youth development organizations as compared with grants for youth which went to other agencies. In 1984, youth development organizations receive 44.6% of the youth dollars; by 1990, their share had risen to 57.7%. While their share of the dollars rose by 13.1%, their share of the number of grants awarded increased by only 6.4%, which means that the size of the grants to the youth development organizations was significantly larger than the average size of the grants to other human service organizations.

Third, Table 21 points up the dominant place of a small number of large national organizations -- Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America, Boy Scouts of America, Boys and Girls Clubs of America, Girl Scouts of the USA, and Junior Achievement. Even

in 1984, these organizations accounted for nearly half of all grants to organizations identified as youth development organizations. At that time, Junior Achievement was the recipient of by far the largest number of grants. By the time the 1990/1991 Grants Index was issued, Boy Scouts of America and Boys and Girls Clubs of America had surpassed Junior Achievement, and Girls Scouts of the USA had about equaled them in the number of grants received. For 1990/91, the five organizations named above received 635 of the 970 grants awarded to youth development organizations, and more than one-third of all of the youth grants awarded. It should be noted that this does not include 112 additional grants awarded to YMCAs and YWCAs which are not included in the youth development category but which are included in the "other human service organization" category.

Fourth, a relatively small -- albeit increasing -- share of foundation grants goes to organizations providing prevention services to youth. In 1990, nearly four percent of the number of total grants awarded by foundations reported in the Index went to agencies for preventive youth services, nearly doubling the comparable share of grants in 1984. The share of dollars for youth was slightly more than double -- from 1% in 1984 to 2.13% in 1990. What remains consistent is that the youth serving organizations' share of the number of grants remains higher than their share of the dollars, which means that the average size of grants for youth purposes is smaller in size than the average size of foundation grants for all purposes. Both in 1984 and 1990, the average grant size for all purposes was

nearly twice as high as the average grant size to agencies for youth programs.

Fifth, Table 22 indicates that in 1990, grants which could be identified as specifically targeting minority youth numbered 146 as compared to 37 in 1984. It should be noted that there is some duplication here since grants which targeted two specific minority groups (for example, Blacks and Hispanics) would be counted twice. In addition, of course, much here depends on how the grant is described; significant numbers of minority groups are assuredly included in other grants as well.

Two other comments may put the situation in further perspective:

- The Foundation Center reports that educational agencies comprise the largest grant recipient group, with human service organizations, as a general category, running second.
- Each Grants Index reports a rise in grants for children and youth. The 1990/1991 Index states that children and youth "continue to be the single largest beneficiary of foundation grant dollars" with their share rising from 7.3% of dollars in 1980 to 12.5% in the current reporting year.

Finally, it should be acknowledged that the 1992 Foundation Grants Index now has been published. The data therein were not available at the time this report was being written. Such data would not have been usable in any event because, in order to account for inflation, the 1992 Foundation Grants Index reports only on grants of $10,000 or above. It reports that

after consistent increases in the percentage of grants for children and youth, in 1992 this percentage dropped from 12.5% to 11.2%. Grants for women and girls dropped from 5.1% to 4.1%, and grants targeted at minorities dropped from 7.9% to 6.3%. These changes are simply noted, since our report does not deal with year to year changes, preferring to examine trends over longer periods of time.

2. United Way of America

United Way of America conducted a special search for the Project, identifying selected allocations reported by United Ways nationwide. Information was broken out for 1985 and 1990 by program and by age group, and reported separately for a selected group of national organizations and for all other organizations receiving United Way funding.

The organizations identified separately included those coded by United Way as

Big Brothers
Big Brothers/Sisters
Big Sisters
Boy Scouts
Boys and Girls Clubs
Boys Clubs
Camp Fire, Inc.
Girl Scouts
Girls Clubs
Catholic Charities
Salvation Army
Urban League
YMCA
YMCA-YWCA
YWCA

All data on groups identified by these names are included. It was not possible to separate funds which went to local affiliates from funds which went to national headquarters. This does not appear to be significant, however, since few local United Ways allocated funds to national headquarters.

There was some difficulty in relating funds allocated for services to youth in 1985 to those in 1990. In 1985, United Way reports included an age category called Teen, which represented 10-19 year olds. In 1990, the same category was included but there was also an overlapping category called Older Child which represented 5-19 year olds. We arbitrarily asked for one-half of that category to be added to the Teen category, thus Tables 23 and 24 compare Teens (10-19) for 1985 with Teens (10-19) plus one-half of Older Child (5-19) for 1990. A large portion of United Way dollars is allocated with reference to no predominant age group, of course. Thus, it must be recognized that the figures presented here for services to youth do not represent all dollars which served that population group.

Table 23 summarizes United Way dollars allocated for services to a predominate age group of 10 to 19 years, breaking out such dollars which went to the agencies named above. Allocations for youth are compared to all dollars allocated by all reporting United Ways for all purposes.

Table 24 uses the same categories to indicate changes in allocations for a selected group of particular program areas in 1985 and 1990.

TABLE #23

UNITED WAY ALLOCATIONS - 1985 AND 1990

	Selected agencies[1]		All other agencies		Totals	
	Dollars	%	Dollars	%	Dollars	%
1985						
Allocation[2] for youth	120,996,892	61.69	75,146,079	38.31	196,142,971	100
All allocations	488,990,762	29.64	1,160,514,238	70.36	1,649,505,000	100
			% all allocations for services to youth - 11.9%			
1990						
Allocation[3] for youth	188,095,708	64.24	104,695,365	35.76	292,791,073	100
All allocations	655,241,535	28.48	1,645,318,445	71.52	2,300,560,000	100
			% all allocations for services to youth - 12.72%			

(1) BIG BROTHERS AND BIG SISTERS, BOY SCOUTS, BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS, CAMP FIRE, GIRL SCOUTS, GIRLS CLUBS, CATHOLIC CHARITIES, SALVATION ARMY, URBAN LEAGUE, YMCA, YWCA

(2) TEENS (10-19 YRS)

(3) TEENS (10-19 YRS) PLUS 1/2 OLDER CHILD (5-19 YRS)

TABLE #24

UNITED WAY ALLOCATIONS TO SELECTED PROGRAM AREAS FOR SERVICES TO YOUTH

Program		Youth Allocations(1)						Total Allocations
		Selected agencies(2)		All other agencies		Total youth		
		Dollars	(%)	Dollars	(%)	Dollars	(%)	
Community Mental Health Maintenance	1985	0	(0.0)	2,271,752	(11.43)	2,271,752	(11.43)	19,872,019
	1990	378,775	(0.9)	3,728,407	(8.90)	4,107,182	(9.80)	41,908,063
Crisis Intervention	1985	612,309	(3.80)	491,217	(3.04)	1,103,526	(6.84)	16,127,260
	1990	130,066	(0.44)	583,485	(1.98)	713,551	(2.42)	29,434,875
Health Education	1985	598,681	(1.01)	2,110,191	(3.54)	2,708,872	(4.55)	59,549,902
	1990	1,510,572	(1.83)	3,615,310	(4.39)	5,125,882	(6.22)	82,374,356
AIDS/HIV+	1985	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1990	0	(0.00)	218,894	(7.84)	218,894	(7.84)	2,793,600
Special Education	1985	701,444	(3.87)	2,812,602	(15.50)	3,514,046	(19.37)	18,144,351
	1990	1,571,230	(5.12)	2,424,537	(7.90)	3,995,767	(13.01)	30,708,662
Informal & Suppl. Education	1985	2,837,516	(19.84)	1,870,969	(13.08)	4,708,485	(32.92)	14,302,651
	1990	4,362,874	(13.67)	1,819,571	(5.70)	6,182,445	(19.38)	31,904,677

TABLE #24 (cont'd)

Program		Youth Allocations(1) Selected agencies(2) Dollars	(%)	All other agencies Dollars	(%)	Total youth Dollars	(%)	Total Allocations
Dropout Prevention	1985	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1990	1,624,956	(40.43)	1,642,689	(40.87)	3,267,645	(81.31)	4,018,917
Administration of Justice	1985	332,356	(3.96)	2,946,665	(35.12)	3,279,021	(39.08)	8,389,719
	1990	1,751,314	(13.92)	1,600,367	(12.72)	3,351,681	(26.64)	12,581,567
Family Preservation	1985	5,651,539	(02.47)	8,122,880	(3.54)	13,774,419	(6.01)	229,144,292
	1990	4,560,352	(01.46)	21,827,557	(6.99)	26,387,909	(8.45)	312,484,987
Recreation	1985	16,868,321	(17.76)	4,394,804	(4.62)	21,263,125	(22.38)	94,991,104
	1990	18,426,024	(22.95)	2,961,967	(3.69)	21,387,991	(26.64)	80,270,803
Social Adjustment	1985	7,612,280	(15.39)	5,311,703	(10.74)	12,923,983	(26.13)	49,466,733
	1990	10,399,352	(18.67)	9,582,812	(17.20)	19,982,164	(35.87)	55,709,895
Social Development	1985	22,989,643	(21.94)	5,475,397	(5.23)	28,415,040	(27.17)	104,764,920
	1990	39,295,531	(29.07)	3,887,387	(2.88)	43,182,918	(31.95)	135,170,288
Youth Development	1985	43,349,377	(38.82)	2,759,867	(2.47)	46,109,244	(41.29)	111,681,996
	1990	69,464,597	(37.99)	4,576,546	(2.49)	74,041,143	(40.48)	182,889,949
All Other Social Develop.	1985	2,673,445	(11.76)	503,505	(2.21)	3,176,950	(13.97)	22,740,512
	1990	3,771,098	(11.55)	576,787	(1.77)	4,347,885	(13.31)	32,663,869

(1) and (2) See Table #23

SOURCE: United Way of America

Keeping in mind the formulation described above, Table 23 indicates that United Way dollars allocated for youth services, as a percentage of all United Way allocations, kept apace between 1985 and 1990. In 1985, total United Way allocations amounted to $1.65 billion. Five years later, in 1990, that amount rose to $2.3 billion (not adjusted for inflation). Over that period of time, the percentage allocated for youth services rose slightly from 11.9% to to 12.7%.

Affiliates of the 11 national organizations included under the column "Selected Agencies" received 61.7% of the youth dollars in 1985; this amount rose to 64.2% of the youth dollars in 1990. Once again, we see that local agencies affiliated with the large national organizations consistently receive the lion's share of youth dollar allocations.

It is interesting to note, as an aside, that these same agencies received a surprisingly large share of all United Way allocations -- approximately 29% in 1985 and 1990. Since large multi-service agencies such as Catholic Charities, Salvation Army, The Urban League, and the Y's are included in this category and we have not been able to disaggregate their allocations, no conclusion can be reached about the percentage of all United Way allocations which went to organizations which are primarily youth serving.

It is very difficult to ascertain the amount of money youth-serving organizations spent on different types of programs. The national organizations do not report on the use

of their dollars from various sources for specific purposes. The closest we have been able to come is in Table 24. Here we selected, from the long list of United Way program codes, fourteen program areas which appear to have the potential for including significant amounts of service to youth, and we have listed the amounts and percentages of dollars allocated for the age group of our interest within each of these program categories. We can draw no general conclusions from this table, but we will highlight selected aspects of Table 24.

- Among the various mental health categories in the United Way coding system, we selected Community Mental Health Maintenance as the one most likely to be preventive in nature. It is interesting to note that, while somewhere between 9.8% and 11.4% of dollars in this category were designated for the youth population, the organizations included under "Selected Agencies" played virtually no role in this area.
- The percentage of Crisis Intervention dollars allocated to our targeted age group dropped by nearly two thirds between 1985 and 1990.
- In 1985, of course, there was no category called AIDS/HIV but even in 1990, only $2.8 million of United Way's $2.3 billion was allocated to this category; 7.8% of the AIDS/HIV dollars were targeted at

youth; and none of this money went to "Selected Agencies."

- Historically, many leisure time and youth serving organizations have referred to some of their services as "Informal Education." United Way data show that while the dollars allocated to their category called "Informal and Supplemental Education" more than doubled between 1985 and 1990, the percentage of these funds targeted at youth dropped sharply.
- Of the relatively modest amount of 1990 allocations designated for "Drop-out Prevention" programs (there was no such category in 1985), 81% were targeted at the youth population, divided almost evenly between the selected agencies and all other agencies.
- Some years ago, the prevention of juvenile delinquency served as the rationale for many youth services but no category referring to delinquency exists within the United Way coding scheme. The closest we could come to this was "Administration of Justice Services." Here the percent targeted at youth has declined and the youth dollars have tilted toward the "Selected Agencies."
- In both 1985 and 1990, Family Preservation services accounted for just under 14% of all United Way allocations. The percentage targeted at youth rose from 6% to nearly 8.5%. In 1985, the "Selected

Agencies" accounted for 41% of youth allocations for family preservation services; by 1990, their share had dropped to 17%.

- While United Way allocations for Recreation dropped, the percentage targeted at youth and at the "Selected Agencies" rose slightly.
- Of the categories entitled Social Adjustment, Social Development and Youth Development, only Youth Development rose as a percentage of all United Way allocations. But it is interesting to note that only approximately 40% of funds designated for youth development were specifically targeted at our designated age group. Well over 90% of these dollars went to the "Selected Agencies" both in 1985 and 1990.

While there are too many unknowns to draw clear overall inferences from Table 24, it is possible to speculate about potential interpretations. The fact that funds allocated for specific program purposes have gone up or down might mean many things. If, for example, the percentage of funds allocated for Social Development or Crisis Intervention has decreased, it is possible that, in fact, such services by agencies have decreased. Alternatively, responsibility for some of these services could have shifted over the years to other organizations such as schools or government agencies. Or the services themselves might not have declined; they might simply be supported by other funds.

Another explanation is that the services do go on -- perhaps they even increase. But now they are called something else. Services which agencies previously designated as "Crisis Intervention" might now be found in the category of "Community Mental Health Maintenance" under "Drug Abuse Prevention and Treatment." Of course, the fact that Dropout Prevention funds are such a small percentage of total United Way allocations may simply mean that more Dropout Prevention work is being done in other than private social agency settings, but it could also mean that agency programs aimed at preventing dropouts are simply subsumed under other program categories. Agencies frequently change what they call services to keep up with the contemporary lingo or to make their services attractive to potential funders. Individual donors, federated funders, government agencies, foundations and corporations shift their priorities with the changing times; youth serving agencies also modify their services to address contemporary problems. But it is difficult to know how much of the change is in the actual service and how much is in the way services are described.

Given these difficulties in differentiating among the services which agencies provide, one must be cautious about reaching hard and fast conclusions about how much money is being spent for various kinds of programs. The United Way of America does an excellent job in compiling fund distribution information. But it should be remembered that these reports are compiled from reports submitted by United Ways on the basis of their

allocations. The service delivering agencies themselves, in general, do not record either their revenue or their expenses in a manner which even approaches the United Way program categories. While the United Way fund distribution results by program category are instructive, the issues outlined and the questions raised above suggest that they should not be taken as definitive.

3. Government

It simply is not possible to put a dollar figure on the amount of government support made available to private agencies for services to young adolescents in at-risk circumstances.

Practically no government programs are directed specifically at young adolescents. But even if one targeted adolescents more broadly as an age group, it would not be possible to state specifically how many government dollars went to serve them. Furthermore, to ascertain those instances in which not-for-profit organizations were recipients of government funds is a task too daunting for this study; and, for the most part, government agencies do not report in a manner which would allow one to determine whether the ultimate beneficiaries of government programs are young people in at-risk circumstances.

As noted earlier, we have no information about the amount of city, county or state funds which go toward the service of youth. A further complication is that much federal funding is funneled through state governments, where it is intermingled

frequently with matching funds, and no one knows how much ultimately winds up in the hands of private agencies.

Yet a further difficulty lies in the varying ways in which government agencies define adolescence. In the health area alone, as a review by the Office of Technology Assessment indicates, the definitions of early, middle, and later adolescence differ from agency to agency. In this area, interestingly enough, OTA finds much agreement on the definition of early adolescence, which appears to be relatively uniformly defined as ages 10 to 14 -- a definition similar to the Task Force's. There is less agreement on what constitutes middle or later adolescence. These comments are not to suggest that it would be preferable to have a single definition which all government agencies should use; it may, in fact, be preferable to permit agencies to cluster age groups in a way which is compatible with the purposes of their program.

Tables 25 and 26 include lists of programs and dollar amounts which, as far as we could determine, are available, at least in part, to the nonprofit sector for youth development purposes. (With one exception, FY 1992 appropriations are not included.) The purpose of these listings is merely to provide the Task Force with a general sense of available funds. We do not claim that all relevant programs are included. We have not totalled the dollars in these programs, for such totals are likely to be misleading.

Our primary reference for Tables 25 and 26 is a report issued by the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families

of the House of Representatives, Federal Programs Affecting Children and Their Families, 1990. Other useful references in compiling these listings included discussions with various federal officials; a survey on adolescent health initiatives conducted by the U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment; The Nation's Investment in Children: An Analysis of the President's FY 1991 Budget Proposals, issued by the Children's Defense Fund in 1990; Adolescents at Risk: Prevalence and Prevention, by Joy G. Dryfoos, 1990; Current Federal Policies and Programs for Youth, by J. R. Reingold and Associates, Inc.; and To Whom Do They Belong? Runaway, Homeless and Other Youth in High-Risk Situations in the 1990s, by the National Network of Runaway and Youth Services, 1991.

Each of these sources takes a cut at describing federal programs for youth from a different perspective. We selected those programs which appear to be targeted, at least in part, at adolescents and potentially available to community based or other nonprofit organizations for youth development programs. Listed below, then, are selected federal programs with dollar amounts for the most recent year we had available at the time this report was being prepared, with comparative funding figures for earlier years. Wherever possible we used fiscal year 1984 for comparative purposes, choosing that time span because it is similar to the period covered by much of the information we received from agencies and other sources. Two factors should be kept in mind: (a) funds appropriated in any fiscal year were

not necessarily spent in that fiscal year, and (b) amounts cited are in real dollars not adjusted for inflation.

In an effort to make the listings below most relevant to the concerns of the task force, the tables which follow do not include the following categories:

- Income maintenance programs
- Medicare
- General health programs, such as the Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant
- General nutrition programs, such as food stamps and WIC
- Foster care, child support enforcement and other programs which did not seem to deal with youth development
- Public housing programs
- Tax credits
- Programs which are not available to nonprofit organizations, such as those which are specifically for schools

Table 25 lists programs primarily targeted at adolescents and available to nonprofit organizations.

Table 26 lists additional programs which are broader in scope, but include services for adolescents and are, at least in part, available to nonprofit organizations.

107

TABLE #25

FEDERAL PROGRAMS TARGETED AT ADOLESCENTS

Program	Fiscal Year	Appropriation (in millions)
Runaway and Homeless Youth Program	1984	$ 23.3
	1991	$ 35.0
Drug Abuse Program for Runaway and Homeless Youth	1989	$ 15.0
	1991	$ 14.8
Juvenile Justice	1984	$ 70.2
	1991	$ 75.3
Transitional Living Grants for Homeless Youth (ages 16-21)	1980	$ 9.8
	1991	$ 9.9
Drug Education and Prevention Relating to Youth Gangs	1989	$ 15.0
	1991	$ 14.8
Adolescent Family Life	1984	$ 14.9
	1991	$ 9.5
School Dropout Demonstration Assistance	1988	$ 23.9
	1989	$ 21.7
Special Programs for Student from Disadvantaged Backgrounds (TRIO)		
o Talent Search	1984	$ 17.6
	1988	$ 26.2
o Upward Bound	1984	$ 70.8
	1988	$ 92.0
Summer Youth Employment Program	1984	$ 724.5
	1989	$ 709.4
High Risk Youth Demonstration Grants (Office for Substance Abuse Prevention)	1988	$ 23.4
	1989	$ 24.5
Community Youth Activity Program (Office for Substance Abuse Prevention)	1989	$ 15.0
Division of Adolescent and School Health (Center for Disease Control) (Other DASH funds are not available to nonprofits)	1991	$ 6.3
Young Americans Act	(no appropriation)	

TABLE #26

FEDERAL PROGRAMS WHICH MAY INCLUDE SERVICES FOR ADOLESCENTS

Program	Fiscal Year	Appropriation (in millions)
Social Services Block Grant	1984	$ 2700
	1989	$ 2700
Child Care and Development Block Grant	1991	$ 150.0
Child Welfare Services	1984	$ 175.0
	1989	$ 257.7
Child Abuse Grants	1984	$ 16.2
	1989	$ 25.3
Child Abuse Challenge Grants	1988	$ 4.8
	1989	$ 4.8
Foster Grandparents	1984	$ 49.7
	1989	$ 58.9
VISTA	1984	$ 16.8
	1989	$ 25.7
Community Services Block Grant	1984	$ 352.3
	1989	$ 380.6
Women's Educational Equity	1984	$ 5.8
	1989	$ 2.9
Drug Free Schools and Communities	1988	$ 229.8
	1989	$ 354.5
Vocational Education: Programs for Community-Based Organizations (Ages 16-21 emphasized)	1988	$ 6.8
	1989	$ 8.9
Law-Related Education	1984	$ 1.0
	1989	$ 4.0
Job Corps	1984	$ 599.2
	1989	$ 741.8
Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Block Grant	1988	$ 462.0
	1989	$ 805.6
Office for Substance Abuse Prevention - Overall (includes OSAP programs specified elsewhere	1990	$ 271.5

TABLE #26 (cont'd)

Program	Fiscal Year	Appropriation (in millions)
Demonstration Grants for Pregnant and Postpartum Women and Their Infants (NIDA and OSAP)	1989	$ 6.5
Pediatric AIDS Health Care Demonstration Programs	1988	$ 4.8
	1989	$ 7.8
Public Health Services Act (Title X)	1980	$ 162.0
	1989	$ 138.0
	1991	$ 144.0
Center for Prevention Services (Center for Disease Control)	(amount unknown)	
U.S.D.A. Extension Service (Amount for 4-H unknown; estimated 25% of overall ES budget devoted to adolescent issues)	1989	$ 361.0
Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)	1984	$ 3605.2
	1990	$ 3929.0
National and Community Service Act	1992	$ 75.0
Steward B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act	(amount undetermined)	

The 35 programs listed in the tables above are drawn from a considerably larger pool of programs which have some impact on children and youth. The report of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families lists approximately 125 programs affecting children and youth; some of the income, nutrition and health programs expend enormous amounts of government funds and are highly significant to the well being of young people.

But relatively few federal dollars are targeted specifically at adolescents, fewer yet are spent on youth development programs in the context of this Project, and almost none target early adolescents specifically.

It is probable that one of the largest youth development programs operating in voluntary settings under the direct supervision of the federal government is the 4-H program of the United States Department of Agriculture's Extension Service. The Extension Service does not report on what portion of its expenditures ($361,370,000 in FY 89) is spent on the 4-H program, although it is estimated that 25% is directed at adolescents. At-risk children and youth have been targeted for expanded 4-H service; $17.5 million in special grants for this area is being awarded to local groups over the course of fiscal years 1991 and 1992, but we do not know what portion of this special grants program is going to adolescents.

Viewed within a broader context, the major national youth development organizations receive a considerably smaller portion of their income from governmental sources than do other

charitable organizations. A recent report from the United Way of America indicates that United Way charities across the country receive 42% of their money from government. But as the national agency tables cited earlier and Table 18 show, the national organizations whose services are primarily youth development could not even approach this percentage.

A still broader, and more current, framework is provided by The Johns Hopkins University in a recent paper entitled The Federal Budget and the Nonprofit Sector: FY 1992, by Lester M. Salamon and Alan J. Abramson. That report finds that "in particular, although the President's FY 1992 budget (outside Medicare and Medicaid) would leave federal support to nonprofits at approximately what it was in 1991, because of prior cuts made earlier in the 1980's, the inflation-adjusted value of federal support to nonprofit organizations in FY 1992 would remain approximately 10% below what it had been in FY 1980. For the FY 1982 - 91 period as a whole, nonprofit organizations lost 33.6 billion dollars in federal support that they would have had available had FY 1980 spending levels been maintained." Salamon and Abramson go on to discuss the extent to which private giving has offset federal reductions. Between FY 1982 and FY 1989, they find, private giving offset only 46% of the cumulative reductions in federal spending "in fields of interest to nonprofits." They do indicate that over this period of time private giving has caught up with the losses in federal revenue that private nonprofit organizations experienced in these

fields: "For the FY 1982 - 89 period as a whole, private giving grew by 52.7 billion dollars, compared to a 33.0 billion short fall in federal support. This is so because Congress held the line on further cuts while private giving continued to grow. At the same time, there is little evidence that the growth of giving has been sufficient to cope with the growing needs left behind by the overall federal cuts and changing and economic problems."

We are unable to relate Salamon and Abramson's estimates of federal cuts directly to the area of youth services. Given the precarious state of the federal budget and the fact that the majority of states face deficits, however, there is no reason to believe that current policies and legislative initiatives will lead to significantly higher levels of government support for youth development efforts in the near future.

Indeed, some current programs have barely escaped elimination or severe reduction. Were it not for the persistent efforts of certain youth advocates, for example, certain juvenile justice and drug-related funds would be far less than they presently are.

In Federal Programs Affecting Children and Their Families, 1990, the Chair and the ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, agree that "Deteriorating conditions have far outpaced the federal government's policy or programmatic response. In addition, many new resources and program initiatives have been oriented toward critical crisis intervention rather than to ensuring families'

long-term economic security or preventing crises from occurring in the first place."

In the face of rising child poverty, there is disagreement about the impact the federal government has had, should have had, or can have on the problem. In the report of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, the section entitled "Republican Additional Views" cautions that the report should not be used to "blame poverty on government policy and funding decisions in the past decade. It cannot be used to 'prove' that a 'new' child policy agenda is needed to provide a package of universal health, income security, education, and social services benefits for all children." They go on to say "... the real problem is a conflict among competing policies, not the absence of policy."

Others differ, particularly regarding youth. In reports prepared for the W.T. Grant Foundation in 1987 and 1989, Reingold and Associates state that the federal government has not provided a "coordinated, comprehensive direction for youth." In 1981, the National Commission on Youth recommended the development of a comprehensive national youth policy at the federal level, together with a Presidential commission to study youth problems and a White House youth office. Numerous other reviews have cited the lack of coordination and the lack of public leadership on children's and youth issues, but few have distinguished between children and adolescents.

The programs listed in Tables 25 and 26 above are administered by a variety of federal agencies. Some suggest that a single agency responsible for coordination of issues related to adolescents would be useful. But such an agency would be hard put to deal with the fragmentation caused by the numerous Senate and House committees and subcommittees which exercise some jurisdiction over programs related to children and youth.

A proposal for a Youth Development Block Grant is being considered currently by some youth agency representatives and many continue to look to the Young Americans Act as the appropriate vehicle for developing effective and coordinated policies, resources and programs for youth. But the funds authorized for that Act have not been appropriated and there appears to be an abatement in the momentum behind efforts to fund this Act.

III. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We have traveled a winding path in our search to understand how voluntary youth development services are funded in America. Along the way, we have received information and assistance from a host of service organizations, funders, and researchers. Even in those instances where organizations did not have the data we sought, their officials frequently had valuable insights to offer.

What meaning can be drawn from the sometimes confusing and conflicting sets of information gathered? The pages which follow reflect only the author's interpretations; these interpretations have emerged not only from the data gathered, but from conversations held with numerous individuals. They are not presented as conclusive. It is hoped that these comments will stimulate the Project Task Force and staff members to find and put forth their own interpretations, thereby broadening and enriching our understanding of the issues.

A. Data Problems

The difficulty in obtaining consistent and reliable data frustrates efforts to determine clearly the amount of funds from different sources available for youth development purposes.

- With regard to federal dollars, the hope at the outset of this project was that we would be able, at least, to approximate the amount available for the Task Force's area of interest. This simply has not been possible. While dollars devoted to selective federal

youth programs can be identified, an overall governmental picture remains elusive.

In inquiries with somewhat different foci, the Congressional Research Service (children and youth) and the Office of Technology Assessment (adolescent health) have described, at some length, similar difficulties they have faced. Many federal dollars which serve youth are buried within broader allocations. The ultimate recipients of funds frequently are not known. Age groups are categorized differently by different agencies. Sequestration sometimes makes appropriation figures unreliable. Comparisons over time are suspect for various reasons, among them the fact that dollars are not necessarily spent in the years they are appropriated, and the lack of conversion to constant dollars. The report of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families contains an article describing the difficulties in such attempts to account for inflation.

Many federal agencies are unable to state the number of recipients of their services. And information about income level, race, and other factors which may relate to at-risk circumstances is not collected.

- It is not possible to obtain nationwide data on funds spent on youth issues by state and local governments.

None of the national public interest groups representing government entities collects such data.

- Many of the national youth-serving agencies do aggregate data from their local affiliates which permit them to report on the dollars their local networks receive from various sources; surprisingly, however, some do not. Those that are able to report on such matters generally do so in broad categories similar to those in the IRS form 990; thus, it is not possible to distinguish government grants from foundation grants, corporate foundations from community foundations from private foundations, local or state government from federal government, etc. Most national agencies can say how many youth they serve. But their age categories vary and it is amazing to learn that many organizations do not routinely collect any information on the race/ethnicity or the income levels of those they serve. Thus, for the most part, they cannot put a dollar figure on their services to at-risk youth. Nor are they able to differentiate among dollars spent at various levels of intervention. And they certainly are unable to make connections between sources of funds and specific programs or age groups.
- The Foundation Center does provide useful information but it is limited. Real dollars, rather than constant

dollars, are the basis for their reports. The special search which they conducted for us was based on 1.6% of active grant-making foundations and 44% of all dollars available. The Center is unable to differentiate grants by types of foundations. And there is no information on the socio-economic characteristics of population groups targeted by grants.

- United Way of America also collects and analyzes very useful information, although there is likely to be some variation in the comprehensiveness of reporting formats among and within United Ways. Further, the data require some manipulation in order to learn about the age group in which we are interested. The United Way of America's analyses do relate dollars to types of services and programs, which is very helpful. But again, they have no information on the race, ethnicity or socio-economic status of those who are recipients of the services they fund.

- Among the most useful and interesting sources of information are specialized studies conducted by independent research and policy organizations. We relied heavily on material presented to us by The Johns Hopkins University. That is the only source we found that consistently reported in constant dollars. Some of their categories did not lend themselves easily to our purposes (such as including youth clubs under

arts, culture and recreation) and it must be remembered that the information from The Johns Hopkins University is not nationwide, covering only selected geographical areas.

- Rarely is it possible to isolate funds for programs which target young adolescents, ages 10 to 15, the group of specific concern to the Task Force. Most of the data either bifurcates this age group or includes it within a broader range of adolescence. One respondent referred to young adolescents as "the forgotten cohort".
- Finally, while we have limited our inquiry to funds directly available to local agencies which provide hands-on youth services, such information cannot be viewed in isolation from the funds available to the national headquarters of youth-serving agencies. It could be misleading to consider local agency expenditures as direct service money, while thinking of national budgets as something else. When the Boys and Girls Clubs of America is awarded a multi-million dollar grant to serve children affected by Operation Desert Storm, such funds surely have an impact on local service. The funds raised by the National 4-H Center in support of the Extension Service's work, at least in part, could legitimately be added to locally available dollars.

It is not suggested here that costly modifications be made in various systems in order to develop uniformity of data that would ease the way for studies such as this. It is probable that the information we do have is sufficient to inform policy decisions and proposals. In any event, there should be some consensus about what information really is needed and how it would be used before embarking on elaborate new information systems.

On the horizon are some hopeful signs that point to the potential for an increase in information which can be utilized for analytical purposes. The Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, in this project and in previous efforts, already has gathered new and significant information about young adolescents and services to them which will be enormously useful in developing proposals for change. The fact that Independent Sector has access to the enormous IRS file on nonprofit organizations could be an invaluable resource for the future. The establishment of the Center for Youth Development and Policy Research at the Academy for Educational Development provides a new locus for the collection and analysis of information to undergird strategies for support of youth development programs.

B. Discernible Trends and Other Inferences

- Of the agencies receiving support from United Ways for youth services, those which are affiliated with the largest national youth-serving organizations continue to receive a significant portion of their funds from

this source, although there is considerable variance among these organizations and the share of their budgets which comes from United Way is decreasing. By comparison, it appears that the smaller independent youth-serving agencies tend to receive considerably smaller portions of their income from United Ways. While more such agencies may be receiving United Way support, the amounts they receive are less. And the number of youth-serving agencies receiving no support from United Ways exceeds the number of those that do. The portion of all United Way funds allocated to the service of adolescents has remained constant over the past five years.

- Similarly, the national youth-serving organizations receive the lion's share of foundation dollars directed at adolescents. The percentage of dollars and grants awarded by foundations to agencies for preventive youth services has approximately doubled since 1984, but the share of dollars for youth in 1990 was still just over 2%, and not quite 4% of the number of total grants awarded for all purposes. Foundation grants for youth are considerably smaller than the average size of grants for all purposes.
- While we have no concrete information regarding the level of corporate funding for youth development programs, corporations do not appear to be a significant or growing source of direct support to agencies

for such programs. Many agencies, nevertheless, look to the corporate sector to increase their resources, and they may benefit from involvement with this sector in other ways. Some portion of corporate donations to United Ways, of course, does reach youth development agencies. Connections with corporate officials may help agencies in their approaches to United Ways and other funding sources. In-Kind support--in the form of technical assistance, volunteers, loaned executives, internships, etc.--is valuable. But as a source of direct financial support, the potential of the corporate world remains largely untapped.

- The large national youth development organizations receive a relatively small portion of their revenue from governmental sources, while smaller independent agencies are considerably more dependent upon government for a major share of their support. There are indications that some independent local agencies are experiencing an increase in government support. Whether such support comes from local, state or federal sources is unknown. We suspect that the differences in levels of governmental support reflect differences in the types of agencies and services. That is, government funds -- frequently via contracts rather than grants -- are used to support services which are more intensively interventive in specific problem areas than general youth development programs

of the type more regularly offered by national youth-serving organizations.

- In general, larger, established agencies and those affiliated with recognizable national organizations appear more able to maintain financial stability and to attract increased support than do smaller unaffiliated agencies. Even in the community-based studies which we have reviewed, where independent agencies are not differentiated from those affiliated with nationals, the evidence suggests that the financial growth of larger agencies outdistances that of smaller ones.
- Agencies of all sorts report that unrestricted support is increasingly difficult to obtain and that fewer funders are willing to provide support for indirect or administrative overhead costs. Agencies, thus, are forced to justify their requests for funds on a program by program basis, and to allocate overhead expenses specifically as direct costs to each program. Funding of discrete projects also tends to inhibit long-range planning.
- Agencies are working hard at diversifying their sources of income. Whether out of fear of the impact of actual and potential cutbacks or concern about reliance on United Way support, agencies continually seek new sources of support, and many are increasing

the income they earn from dues, fees for service, and sales. While diversification lessens dependence on single sources, it also increases fundraising and accounting costs. Furthermore, to the extent that service recipients must increase payments for dues and fees, the accessibility of services to low-income youth could be decreased.

o Most agency officials agree that the funding market place is increasingly and intensively competitive. Some attribute this to the fact that there are simply many more agencies competing for the same funds. Others cite the difficulty in competing with other areas of need which capture the public attention, such as health care, the elderly, etc. Many -- even representatives of the large national organizations which have not received substantial government funds -- share the perception that government cutbacks and the danger of further cutbacks are forcing more agencies into competition for funds from other sources.

o Few agencies are able to cite new and innovative approaches to fundraising. Many of the national organizations are providing their locals with assistance aimed at increasing their sophistication in the fundraising and grantsmanship arena -- which may be yet another advantage that affiliates of nationals have over independent agencies. Surprisingly, relatively few of the youth-serving organizations do much

in the way of direct mail solicitation -- a technique used extensively by many other causes -- although some report experimentation with this method.

- For those organizations which report any income from endowments, such income seems to be dropping as interest rates drop and as agencies are forced to dip into their capital. It would be interesting to compare the experience of such local agencies with the budgets of large national organizations with endowments or large operating surpluses.
- Feelings of agency officials vary regarding the potential impact of the movement toward donor choice in federated fundraising. Some of the larger organizations whose names are household words express little concern, confident that their name recognition will sustain them. Other established organizations fear that some of the new, single-purpose organizations will take funds away from "traditional" agencies which have been laboring in the social vineyard for a long time. Smaller agencies, in particular, are concerned about the costs they will need to incur in order to compete adequately in the donor choice marketplace.
- Certain of the national organizations identified as "youth-serving" serve fewer adolescents than we had anticipated. Even some, such as 4-H, whose early adolescent population is a majority of those served

(58% ages 10 to 15) report a trend toward younger children. Only 9% of the girls in the Girl Scouts of the USA are 11 years old and over; 60% of the Girl Scouts are between 5 and 8 years old. Boy Scout statistics indicate that 51% of their population is 10 years old and younger. Camp Fire, which reports by school grade, indicates that 87% of those it serves are in grades K to 5, 11% are in grades 6 to 8, and 2% are in ninth grade and over. Compare this with Girls, Incorporated, where 66% of those served are nine and over, or with Boys and Girls Clubs of America, where 63% are 10 years of age and older (53% are between 10 and 15 years of age), or Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America, where 68% of those served are 11 years old and older. It appears that what one respondent refers to as the "uniformed youth organizations" tend to serve a higher proportion of younger children than some of their counterparts.

Explanations vary. In spite of efforts to make programs more relevant to teenagers, these organizations seem to have difficulty attracting and keeping adolescents. Their efforts to reach the younger child market appear to have been more successful. Younger children tend to be more of a captive audience, whereas older youth can more readily choose not to participate in programs which don't interest them.

Some organizations explain their concentration on younger children as a way of beginning to affect their development earlier and therefore more effectively. Or they suggest that if they can bring children into their organizations at an earlier age, they will be more likely to retain them when they become adolescents. The larger pool of younger children does help to keep population figures up and serves as a source of continued or increased revenue. Not only do these agencies apparently find it more difficult to retain older youth, but some claim that services to this age group are more expensive than services to younger children, requiring more skilled staff, more costly settings, and more interaction with the community.

Another explanation is that the shift toward a younger population in some organizations might simply reflect the smaller size of older cohorts. Statistical Abstracts of the U.S., 1990, reports that between 1980 and 1988, the population aged 10-14 declined by nine percent in the U.S., while the population aged 5-9 increased by eight percent.

- While the lack of statistics on race, ethnicity, and economic conditions hampers our understanding of the extent to which youth-serving organizations serve youth in at-risk circumstances, it is possible to discern some differences. Many of the national organizations are developing program initiatives and

outreach efforts designed to position them on the cutting edge of the issues important to today's youth, their families, and society in general. As a result of such initiatives, some groups are able to report an increase in minority enrollment (example: The Girl Scouts of the U.S. went from 10.4% minority in 1979 to 15.7% in 1989). The Girl Scouts, the Boy Scouts (18% minority), and Camp Fire (18% minority) continue, nevertheless, to serve largely white and predominantly middle class populations, as compared to smaller, independent community-based groups, and as compared to certain other national organizations. Big Brothers/ Big Sisters of America serves 30% minority youth, 35% below the poverty level; Girls Incorporated serves 51% minority girls, 63% from families earning $15,000 per year or less; affiliates of the National Network of Runaway and Youth Services serve 36% nonwhite, 39% below the poverty level; Boys and Girls Clubs of America serve 51% minority, 81% with family income under $20,000; half of those served by CWLA affiliates are minority; and, of course, the percentage of ethnic and racial minorities and low income youth served by organizations such as the National Urban League, ASPIRA, and the Salvation Army is quite high.

Again citing Statistical Abstracts of the U.S., 1990, the population aged 10-14 declined by twelve percent for whites, but by only three percent for

Blacks. Similarly, those aged 5-9 increased by six percent for whites, but by eleven percent for Blacks. On the basis of these figures, one would expect youth development organizations to report higher proportions of Black youth, simply because they are becoming a larger proportion of the target population.

The significant disparity in the amount of resources devoted to the service of youth at-risk in different types of organizations is a factor which surely warrants further attention by the Task Force.

C. The Relationship between Funding and Service Patterns

The limited scope of this inquiry permits no definitive judgment about the overall relationship between dollars and the amount, nature or quality of services for adolescents in at-risk circumstances. We would like, nevertheless, to discuss now certain connections and patterns -- frequently anomalous -- which appear to be deserving of further analysis.

To begin with, any effort to make a simple connection between numbers of dollars and numbers of young people served raises more questions than it answers. One youth-serving organization, in response to our inquiry, simply related the percentage of their overall dollars spent on young adolescents to the percentage of that age group in the overall population served by them. But such a simplistic approach says nothing about actual costs or about the different costs involved in serving different populations.

The difficulty in making such judgments can be seen by examining the dollars spent and the number of youth served in the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of the USA. What accounts for the fact that Boy Scouts, at the local affiliate level, served 4.3 million young people with $339 million, while the Girl Scouts served 2.5 million young people with a similar amount of money, $335 million? It might merely be attributable to differences in accounting procedures. Or does it have something to do with the fact that a sizeable portion of young men and women served by the Boy Scouts are seen for brief periods of time in classroom settings? Does it have to do with other differences in the nature and quality of programs? The Boy Scouts serve a slightly higher percentage of minority youngsters and a larger percentage of older youth, making those characteristics improbable factors in the equation. Without further information about the nature of the organizations, programs, and clientele involved, judgments about per capita expenditures cannot be made.

Other questions arise about the impact of different funding conditions on the nature and context of services provided. For example, does the somewhat easier access to private funding by affiliates of recognized national organizations enable them to operate more independently than other cognate service organizations? Correspondingly, does greater reliance on government funds require independent youth organizations to coordinate more with public agencies or other organizations that also receive government funds?

At a somewhat more discrete level, it would appear reasonable to believe that increasing dues and fees for service would decrease the number of low-income youth who are able to take advantage of the services. The tendency of organizations' reports to combine dues and fees, however, does cloud the situation. Disaggregating dues from fees would enhance analysis. By such disaggregation it is possible to account for the apparent anomaly of the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, where dues and fees revenue rose more sharply than any other source between 1985 and 1989--nearly tripling in amount and more than doubling as a percentage of their revenue--yet 81% of the youth they serve come from families earning under $20,000 per year. Most of this increase came from sliding scale fees for special services such as summer camp and after-school child care, which permitted those who can afford it to pay a larger share without limiting access to lower-income youth.

Let us move now to a brief examination of the factors involved in shifting priorities of funding organizations. We already have spoken to the reluctance of many funders to support indirect or overhead costs, which appears to be the case whether the funding source is government, United Way, corporate or foundation. Government, of course, is unique because what it will fund is directed both by legislative and executive branch influences. In the Department of Labor, for example, one can see a greater emphasis on youth programs under CETA in the late 70's and early 80's. One can also perceive shifts in the providers of choice from the 60's, when community-based organizations

were favored under the early MDTA program, to later years when funds were funneled primarily to local and state government agencies, and more recently when government/business partnerships have been favored.

Other factors influence the direction of government dollars. Government agencies are not immune to constituent advocacy and pressure. Noted earlier was the significant role played by advocacy organizations in retaining legislation related to juvenile delinquency and substance abuse. Another case in point is NIMH, which at one point was a considerable source of dollars for innovative service programs which were community based, perceived as preventive, and focused on youth. NIMH has backed away from service in favor of research, from prevention in favor of treatment, and from community/sociological approaches in favor of biological approaches. Much of this is in response to pressure from organizations which represent the mentally ill.

Furthermore, the fact that certain funding sources may show shifts over the years in the funding of youth development agencies does not necessarily mean a significant change in the resources devoted to youth development activities. Sometimes it simply means a change in jurisdiction. If one simply examined the Administration for Children and Families, one might be led to believe that the government's attention to juvenile justice issues has diminished, when in fact the responsibility simply moved to the Department of Justice. Similarly, some experts believe that certain youth development functions increasingly

may have been assumed by the educational system and that the role of nonprofits must be viewed in that context.

The shift on the part of nongovernmental funders from general support to project funding reflects more than simply a desire to invest their funds in programs rather than administration. It reflects the fact that they are developing their own agendas. One large recipient of corporate funds indicates that it used to rely heavily on general purpose funds from corporations which simply wanted to support its activities. As an example of the changes this agency is facing, it points to a major automobile manufacturer which now wants to fund certain programs aimed at mentoring minority youth, out of the manufacturer's interest in increasing the number of minority car dealerships over a period of time, and thus increasing its share of the minority car buyers' market.

Foundations, too, are developing more discrete priorities in an effort to concentrate their resources in areas where they believe they can serve best. Much of this may be commendable, signifying more thoughtful consideration of needs and priorities, but it also means less discretion for service providers that have to tailor their roles and their programs to the priorities of funding organizations.

Conflicting reports on the nature of funders' priorities permit no conclusions about trends. While some organizations perceive increased interest in programs which are more interventive, rather than developmental, the perception is not universal. At least one organization -- WAVE, which provides

school-based multi-purpose community programs -- reports increased interest in dropout prevention programs at the expense of programs targeting "recovery" efforts for those who already have dropped out.

While it may be true that service organizations "follow the dollar", the question is how far will they follow it? When agencies do follow the dollar, to what extent do they change their focus and to what extent do they simply describe what they do in new terms, playing the funder's game in order to keep on working at the mission they have established?

To a certain extent, we must ask "What's in a name?" Yesterday's organizations may have said they were preventing juvenile delinquency; today they may claim to prevent drug abuse or early pregnancy. Yesterday's crisis intervention services may be called something different today. As agencies respond to funders' priorities and to the changing public perception of problems, the extent to which they are changing their basic approach to youth development services remains unclear.

A somewhat different point of view was expressed by one expert we interviewed. That person suggests that agencies do, in fact, change what they do in response to funders' priorities, but the influx of dollars to certain agencies may have been counterproductive, in that those dollars went into peripheral activities. That is, in order to get funds, agencies have been diverted into activities which may have been in the funder's interest but actually contributed little to or even detracted from the agency's service.

Our understanding of the effect of funding on the extent, quality, and nature of youth development programs might be enhanced by one further line of inquiry. Some experts have expressed an interest in determining which funds actually go to support services for young adolescents in at-risk circumstances, as compared to funds which go to "umbrella organizations" or other institutions and mechanisms with a secondary interest such as the enhancement of coordination, information exchange, etc. It might be useful to get a picture of the extent to which funds go to such organizations, whether such organizations are duplicative and competitive, and whether they enhance or detract from service.

Finally, it should be noted that we have not examined the geographical distribution of resources for youth development activities. Rural advocates suggest that, with certain obvious exceptions such as 4-H, rural youth do not receive an adequate share of attention from national organizations, even though their circumstances may be as severe as urban youth. One respondent suggested that in certain isolated areas, money may not be the most significant problem. Even if funds are available, the lack of structures and providers inhibits the appropriate use of such funds. It is recognized that economies of scale might tilt organizational decisions toward heavily populated areas, but surely the special needs of youth in isolated areas require special consideration. It might be useful to examine the distribution of affiliates of significant

national organizations and their requirements for establishing new units, in order to determine the equity of coverage.

D. There Must Be a Better Way

Although the big picture portraying the funds available nationwide from various sources for youth development purposes has not been developed as clearly as we might like, a different set of smaller, disturbing images are projected repeatedly onto our consciousness. These are pictures of hundreds of thousands of agency staff members, board members, and other volunteers knocking on doors; writing competing proposals; vying for corporate attention; running fundraising special events; conducting mail and phone solicitations; appearing at United Way allocation hearings; attending fund-raising workshops; reading the rules established by regulators and standard setters with initials such as FASB, NCIB, CBBB, OMB, and GAO; registering at state offices of charitable solicitation; and developing evaluations and reports in order to demonstrate their accountability to funders, regulators and taxing authorities.

Many of these direct-service organizations are fortunate enough to get some help in revenue production from their affiliation with national organizations. But national organizations and independent locals alike increasingly seek advantage in the funding marketplace from an army of experts associated with the emerging profession of fundraisers. One has only to read the want-ads in such periodicals as The Chronicle of Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Times to realize that virtually all of the

jobs listed are for financial development positions or for executives with fundraising skills.

Frankly, we see no way out of this maze. While certain cooperative advocacy approaches -- by consortia of nonprofits or youth-serving organizations -- may help to redirect funds or develop additional funds for nonprofit youth development programs, ultimately it is left to each agency to struggle to get its share. Such competition appears to be endemic to the American way of supporting charitable institutions. While those whose causes are better understood and whose names are better recognized will have a "leg up", there is likely to be no change in our current system which requires each agency to justify its need and to compete with others for the resources of multiple funders.

This picture may not appear so bleak to some. They would see it as Darwinian: agencies which can demonstrate their effectiveness will survive and prosper. But what happens to youth who are dependent upon service from agencies that may serve them well but are less sophisticated in the fundraising arena?

While we find few, if any, ideas for providing agencies with needed funds on a more rational or equitable basis, there are proposals afoot for coordinating, concentrating and enlarging the funds available for services to young people. By and large, such proposals deal with public dollars. For nongovernmental dollars, the United Way and other federated fundraising approaches (including newer alternative funds) now serve as one

way of rationalizing and reducing the fragmentation of the allocation of private donations. There also are emerging examples of cooperative endeavors among foundations, designed to promote synergy and increase the impact of their dollars. There are ways for the government to enhance voluntary giving. Increasing tax deductions for charitable contributions is one such approach. Another is the semi-postal stamp in use in other countries. This offers citizens an opportunity to add a voluntary contribution to the cost of postage stamps; money collected through this device goes into a special fund for children and youth.

The Young Americans Act holds promise, if funded, for focusing federal attention on adolescents. And proposals are afoot, in the Congress and organizations which advocate for youth, to create a youth development block grant which, for the most part, would go directly to local communities -- bypassing states -- for need assessments, planning, collaboration and service delivery. One such proposal currently focuses on 10-15 year olds.

In some respects, the most innovative proposals may be those which would protect and/or increase funds available for children and youth, by levying special taxes or setting aside specified tax funds for such purposes. For some years, there have been advocates for a Children's Trust which would include both federal grant programs and tax credits, and would gain new funding by enacting a progressive payroll tax, in which both

employers and employees would participate. Estimates are that the Trust would provide approximately $23 billion in revenues.

The Juvenile Welfare Board of Pinellas County, Florida, pioneered the concept of special taxing districts for youth in 1946 when county residents voted to tax themselves up to one-half mill on county property for services to children; the tax rate there has increased and the concept of special taxing districts has been expanded to other areas. Seattle and Minnesota have special taxes, and, most recently, San Francisco residents voted to set aside 2.5% of annual property tax revenue for a special children's fund.

It should be noted that young adolescents may not find a favored place in such set-asides, which are generally designated for younger children. Furthermore, while the idea of such set-asides has received considerable support, it is not without controversy. Both the Children's Trust and the special taxing districts establish mechanisms intended to protect funds for children and youth, operating outside the normal appropriation systems. Special purpose taxes have been enacted for many purposes in addition to the support of children and youth services. While some advocate special tax districts as a way of circumventing the changing whims of elected officials, others believe that it is bad public policy, in that it creates inequities, divides society, perpetuates priorities of the moment, and diminishes the authority of the elected representatives of the people.

The Ford Foundation report, The Common Good: Social Welfare and the American Future recommended expanded taxation of Social Security, with increased revenues to be allocated to a new trust fund reserved for the support of its proposals. A seminar of experts convened by the National Academy of Social Insurance raised serious questions about the trust fund proposal in its report, Social Policy: Looking Backwards, Looking Forward. While such proposals are put forth in the best interests of young people in our society they should be examined carefully. If enacted, they would likely enhance and expand the dollars available in the service of young people. At a theoretical level, one must ask whether governmental funding priorities should be left in the hands of democratically elected and appointed officials, or whether it is best that "special interest groups" such as youth advocates should be able to preempt a portion of public funds for their own purposes. At a more practical level, the question is: if certain tax funds are to be specially designated, how will youth development agencies fare when they have to compete with such popular causes as health care, AIDS, and the environment? And even if funds were specially designated for young people, where would young adolescents emerge on the priority list, in competition with younger children or older adolescents?

E. Potential Recommendations

The Task Force on Youth Development and Community Programs has both an enormous opportunity and a terrible burden as it attempts to grapple with these issues and develop innovative

and practical proposals for enhancing the nation's services to early adolescents in at-risk circumstances.

As the Task Force faces the formidable task of shaping its recommendations, it may wish to consider some of the following approaches to developing stable and equitable funding for youth development programs.

1) Increased, consolidated and dedicated government support

Governmental responsibility for promoting the general welfare can be carried out in several ways. With regard to services needed in the nation's interest, government can pay for such services; it can provide such services; it can regulate such services. The need for youth development services to be delivered in thousands of localities in a community-relevant fashion indicates that the federal government is not the provider of choice. And there is little evidence of the need for federal regulation of such services at this time. But without appropriate federal financial support, it is likely that community-based youth development programs will not be adequately funded.

Currently, federal funding available for youth services is largely a) fractionated, b) targeted at categorical problems, rather than at developmental needs of adolescents, and c) buried in programs of broader intent. Some fear that funding structures with explicit focus on adolescent development might create artificial disjunction

between the developmental needs of older and younger groups, but most youth advocates perceive the need for consolidated funding for local agencies to develop, improve and expand coordinated youth development programs. The Task Force may wish to consider:

- Support for a youth development block grant, which may be the most promising national approach now on the horizon. Legislation for such a block grant should include:
  - a clear conceptualization of the developmental needs of youth and a definition of appropriate services, eligible for support
  - significant new money, diverted from less essential portions of the federal budget. The Task Force could help to frame a national debate in terms of potential tradeoffs.
  - consolidation of funds redirected from existing categorical, problem-oriented programs
  - provision for direct funding to local communities, without passing through state governments. When local governmental structures are not willing or able to develop adequate proposals, provision should be made for alternative applications from not-for-profit organizations
  - a formula which targets a considerable portion of funds at communities at risk

- a requirement for coordinated, if not comprehensive, strategies
- provision for significant participation of local institutions and citizens, including youth
- eligibility for both nonprofit and public providers
- payment for administrative, overhead and indirect expenses
- in addition to support for planning, developing and delivering services, funds for development of a cadre of trained youth development workers, and for evaluation, information exchange and technical assistance.

o Support for funding of the Young Americans Act, which would buttress a service-oriented block grant with a central locus for data collection, information provision, and national policy and strategy development

o Further examination of the various proposals for specially designated taxes for youth development. An initial step could be convening of advocates and critics of proposals such as a Children's Trust, special taxing districts, etc.

o Further exploration of the appropriate place of state governments in supporting youth development services. Lack of data about the current level of state support prohibits specific recommendations at this time, but

precarious fiscal conditions at state and local governmental levels suggest a cautious approach to proposing new burdens for them. Foundation sponsorship of a study in conjunction with one or more of the national associations of state government entities could lead to the accumulation of data on the extent of current state support for youth services and the development of recommendations for the future.

o Efforts to tap education funding by extending eligibility for certain programs--now available only to school--to nonprofit agencies. After considerable effort by nonprofits, certain provisions in the National and Community Service Act were changed from "school-based" to "school-aged," thereby making nonprofits potential recipients of grants for partnerships with schools. Since the agencies discussed in this paper share educational purposes with schools (albeit they use different approaches), it would seem appropriate for them to have access to education funds, particularly for school-agency partnerships.

2) Principles, guidelines, standards

It is assumed that the Task Force will encourage private funders to provide more support for the services it espouses and national agencies, where appropriate, to

devote more of their resources to the developmental needs of young adolescents in at-risk environments. Is it possible to go beyond the provision of data intended to raise awareness (such as the data in this report about the relatively small percentage and size of foundation grants for youth) beyond programmatic suggestions, beyond exhortation? We put forth -- in hesitant and unformed fashion -- the possibility of promulgating more specific principles or guidelines. For example:

- o that United Ways should allocate no less than a specified percentage of their funds for general -- as compared to project -- support of youth development agencies.
- o that foundations, corporations and United Ways should be willing to include at least a certain amount of support for indirect or overhead costs in project-oriented grants
- o that national youth agencies in order to warrant public support, should establish goals for their headquarters and their affiliates, such as:
  - a specified percentage of funds dedicated to the service of young adolescents in at-risk circumstances, or
  - a specified percentage of their service population which comes from high-risk communities, or
  - a specified proportion of local affiliates

located in census tracts or other geographical entities that exhibit at-risk conditions

If indeed, the development of such guidelines or standards appears to the Task force to be a viable option, the agencies themselves should be engaged through the good offices of organizations such as the National Collaboration for Youth.

3) <u>A level playing ground for the fund-raising competition</u>

While all organizations devote considerable energy and resources to raising funds, it does appear that larger agencies and those affiliated with recognizable national groups are more successful, and that smaller independent agencies face a more difficult task and spend a disproportionate share of their resources in fund-raising, with less payoff. Size, of course, is not the only relevant factor. Board composition or the varying resources of different communities (is there a sufficient business or population base to support fundraising efforts?) are important, also.

But even if the available funds were increased through mechanisms such as a youth development block grant, what would assure poorer agencies of an opportunity to compete adequately for those funds? Two possibilities come to mind.

First is the development of alliances with like organizations. In numbers and in unity, there is

strength. While such strength might increase attention to their needs, however, it might not enhance the position of particular agencies, which still must compete even with their allies.

A second approach is to enhance the ability of the less competitive agencies to fend for themselves in the fund-raising arena. Emerging organizations have special needs. Small agencies need information about available funds and their sources; they need the skills to make their case to funders; they need time and resources if they are to have a fair shot at a share of available funds.

Where are they to get the help they need? Management assistance programs are available in some places, and there is evidence of increasing foundation attention to enhancing the fund-raising capacity of agencies. And some United Ways make fund-raising assistance available, even to non-United Way agencies.

Community foundations have great potential for offering assistance in this area, and indeed many are doing so. They should be encouraged to create additional financial development mechanisms which would provide local agencies with information about available funds, grantsmanship training and skill enhancement, technical assistance and hands-on personnel to help with fund-raising efforts. The Coalition of Community Foundations for Youth, a consortium of forty community foundations interested in youth development, and supported with $1.7

million in Rockefeller Foundation funds, is a potentially powerful advocate for increased community foundation support for youth development services. This consortium could, in addition to its other activities, encourage community foundations throughout the country to provide small, independent, grass-roots youth-serving agencies with the tools they need to compete in the fund-raising marketplace.

Another potential source for such assistance, in some communities, could be alternative federated funds.

4) <u>A national nongovernmental center for youth development</u>

A strong independent non-profit center on youth development could be an important part of the mix. Such a center could advance research and theory development; collect, analyze and disseminate information; enhance innovation and evaluation; educate the public and decision-makers; and serve as an advocate for increased support for programs serving young adolescents in at-risk environment.

5) <u>Further study</u>

Several topics surfaced in the course of developing this report which might warrant further exploration.

- the need for more useful and standardized data collection and reporting about funding for youth services, including information about sources

about which little is now known, such as corporations, state and local government, and alternative funds

- the role and potential of various umbrella organizations
- the extent to which the budgets of national headquarters supplement direct services provided by their local affiliates
- the reasons for variances in the levels of support provided by United Ways to affiliates of different national organizations
- what motivates funders to establish certain priorities
- the extent to which increases in dues and fees for service limits access by low-income youth and their families
- the need for more understanding of how youth-serving organizations spend their money. This report dealt only with revenue issues, but recommendations regarding reallocation of funds should be based, as well, on knowledge about the uses to which revenues are put.
- opportunities for cooperative cost-sharing and cost-saving efforts by independent agencies
- comparisons between the cost of serving adolescents and other age groups

150

- other innovative approaches to increasing funds available for youth development services, such as the semi-postal stamp.

6) A cautionary note

Anyone who deals with youth workers and youth-serving agencies is moved by the burden they face as they attempt to juggle the needs of their clients with the demands of others. Particularly for small agencies, every report which is written, every paper filed with a funder or a government agency competes with service expectations. While accountability is necessary, we need to be careful that measures to improve service -- planning, coordinating, evaluating, accounting, reporting, and the like -- are not unwittingly imposed in a way which may unnecessarily diminish such service.